FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 194 7 October 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Steady Rise' Seen in U.S. Nuclear Tests [Ignatyev] AA 1
Seismologists Cited on Test Monitoring AA 1
IZVESTIYA Interviews Antinuclear Physician AA 2
[Ivanko, 2 Oct]
Bulgarian Journalist Visits Soviet Test Site AA 3
[Atanasov in Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 29 Sep]
U.S. 'Pushing' Bacteriological War Preparations AA 5
[Peace and Progress]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'Studio 9' Program Views Summit, Afghanistan, PRC CC 1
[Zorin, Primakov, Zhurkin]
'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 14
[Patsyok, Shishlin, Levin, Kornilov, Kasparov, Pravdin]
CSCE Preparatory Meeting Ends, Envoy Comments CC 17
IAEA Conference Session Closes in Vienna 3 Oct CC 17

REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

Reagan Outlines Approach to Reykjavik Parley DD 1
Shishlin: Meeting To Give 'Strong Stimulus' to Summit DD 1
'Pointless' Disputes Waged Over Who 'Won,' Name DD 2
[Korionov in PRAVDA 4 Oct]
U.S. Spokesman's Claim of Human Rights Focus Hit DD 3
[Sokolov]
Drobkov Views Reykjavik Import, Week's Events DD 3
[PRAVDA 5 Oct]
Delhi Six Urge Joint Nuclear Accord With U.S. DD 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

White House Spreading 'Misinformation' on Libya A 1
Daniloff Confirms Espionage Charges 'Validity' A 1
U.S. To Resume Cruise Missile Tests in Canada A 2

CHINA

Bilateral Consultations With PRC Begin B 1
PRC Educational Delegation Completes Visit B 1
[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]

SOUTH ASIA

India's Verkateswaran Meets With Vorontsov D 1
Received by Dobrynin D 1
DRA To Establish Reconciliation Commission D 1
[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]
Work Begins on Joint Afghanistan Power Line [PRAVDA 28 Sep] D 1
Briefs: DRA TV Station Project D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

IZVESTIYA Reports Gromyko-Heng Samrin Meeting [4 Oct] E 1
Heng Samrin Departs E 1
Australians 'Intimidated' by Soviet Threat E 2
U.S. Policy Contrast to Soviet Asian Proposals E 3
[Shabayev]

EASTERN EUROPE

Continued Coverage of GDR Ceremony Festivities F 1
Honecker Address [East Berlin]
SEW's Schmitt Speaks [ADN] F 3
DKP's Mies Speaks [ADN] F 4
Gorbachev, Ligachev at Dinner F 5

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Shevardnadze Holds Press Conference in Mexico K 1
Confirms Submarine Deaths [AFP] K 4
PRAVDA: Shevardnadze Mexico Trip Communique [6 Oct] K 4
Shevardnadze Departs Mexico 5 October K 8

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Editorial Views Restructuring Process [2 Oct] R 1
Economist Ambartsumov on Obstacles to Reform R 3
[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 5-6 Oct]
Program Discusses Role of Social Sciences [Frolov, Pryakhin] R 5
Labor Official Comments on Wage Reform [Kalenov] K 7

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1783 Satellite Launched Successfully U 1
Antarctic Base Damaged by Glacier Break U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

TASS Announces Nuclear Submarine Sinks 6 Oct V 1
AFP Reports Shevardnadze Confirms Sub Deaths [cross-reference] V 1
Conference on Patriotic Education Held in Baku V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Sep]

'STEADY RISE' SEEN IN U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

LD061001 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 6 Oct 86

[Text] Washington October 6 TASS -- Correspondent Ignor Ignatyev reports:

The U.S. Department of Energy, which supervises the development of advanced types of nuclear weapons, envisions a steady rise in the nuclear tests over the next five years, say official documents submitted at the request of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

According to the department's plans, between fiscal 1987, which started on October 1, and fiscal 1991, the funds for nuclear testing for military purposes will grow by 60 per cent. The appropriations for the preparation and conducting of nuclear testing will rise from 500 million dollars under the budget of the current fiscal year to 850 million dollars in five years' time.

This massive programme envisions the tests of laser weapons, nuclear-pumped X-ray weapons and other weaponry that is being developed under the Strategic Defence Initiative plans, and also several new types of missile warheads and bombs.

Giving a written reply to a question from Senator Edward Kennedy, a member of the Armed Services Committee, the Energy Department said that the testing and production of nuclear weapons could be expected to continue into the 21st century.

This stand clearly shows why Washington continues to oppose a total nuclear test ban. The renunciation of nuclear testing even for a short period of time does not fit into the plans of the Administration.

THE WASHINGTON POST, reporting on the nuclear test programme planned by the U.S. Department of Energy, says that since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium in August last year, the United States has carried out 21 tests at the Nevada test site.

SEISMOLOGISTS CITED ON TEST MONITORING

LD041406 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Report by correspondent Vladimir (Lyashko) from a nuclear test monitoring station in Kazakhstan; date not given]

[Text] Let me recall that a joint experiment in monitoring nuclear tests is being carried out under an agreement between scientific organizations of the United States and the USSR. As part of this experiment it had been planned to deploy a network of seismic stations around the Soviet and U.S. nuclear proving grounds. This kind of network has already been created in the neighborhood of our testing ground. Three monitoring stations are in operation. From one of them, I am presenting my report. And now, as we examine another magnetic recording, we see on the display screen characteristic blips: the noiseless electronic echo of a nuclear explosion in Nevada. Two people are at work at the display, Dave (Carroll) a member of staff of the University of California, and Vladislav Georgiyevich (Martynov) his colleague from the Institute of Earth Physics of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin (Carroll) recording in English] It is my job to come here and record nuclear explosions so if I do or... My job is to record seismicity, but if I do record an explosion... [end recording]

[Begin recording] [Lyashko] Vladislav Georgiyevich, Dave has said that for him this event is simply work. How do you regard it?

[(Martynov)] You know it's a serious question. I think that in this kind of work one has to show not just professionalism but some kind of humaneness, too -- qualities that bear witness to a person's position, particularly the position of the scientific worker. We seismologists are trying to help society make the world safe and I think that the position of noninterference in such a case is dangerous. You know what I would like to remind you of? The purpose of this work. The purpose of it is not to obtain new scientific data -- although, of course, that will happen -- the purpose is to convince the world by this cooperation, by this joint work, that it is possible to register any kind of test, that it is possible to monitor the silence of the nuclear proving grounds. [end recording]

IZVESTIYA INTERVIEWS ANTINUCLEAR PHYSICIAN

PM031359 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Ivanko interview with Academician M.I. Kuzin of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, director of the A.V. Vishnevskiy Surgery Institute, under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Physicians' Opinion" -- date and place unspecified]

[Text] The International Day of Action by Physicians in Defense of Peace, which is being celebrated following a decision by the fourth international congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement, falls 1 October. One of those who was in at the beginning of the movement was Academician M.I. Kuzin of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, director of the A.V. Vishnevskiy Surgery Institute. My talk with him started with a question about the goals facing the movement of physicians for the prevention of nuclear war.

[Kuzin] Our movement started in 1980, when three doctors from the Soviet Union met with three U.S. physicians in Geneva. We discussed the question of what physicians could do to prevent nuclear war in this unstable world. We as physicians realized the catastrophic medical consequences that the use of nuclear weapons could have. We also realized that in the event of a general nuclear catastrophe physicians would be powerless to do anything. The only way of safeguarding people's health is to struggle for the prevention of nuclear war -- that is, using medical language, to carry out preventative treatment.

Our movement immediately found support among the scientific community in many countries. The movement's aims were drawn up. The main thing is we must inform the public of the catastrophic medical consequences of a nuclear war and dispel the illusion that it is possible to stage and win a limited nuclear war. In our opinion, nuclear weapons should not be used to wage war because of their medical and ecological consequences. We are dealing with weapons of genocide, a means of annihilating mankind. We also aim to give medical workers information, involve young physicians in the movement, and even influence our patients.

One congress adopted a resolution of printing the aims of the movement on the back of prescriptions. At the suggestion of the Soviet committee of "Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" a paragraph obliging physicians to struggle for peace and the prevention of nuclear war has been inserted in the text of the Hippocratic oath.

[Ivanko] Physicians from various countries are represented in the movement. Are they united in their assessment of the Soviet peace initiatives?

[Kuzin] M.S. Gorbachev's replies to the questions from the chief editor of RUDE PRAVO formulated a program which the movement has advocated throughout its existence. At our fourth congress in Helsinki we clearly stated that ending all nuclear tests is the main recipe for survival.

[Ivanko] Many scientists, including physicists, say that, according to new figures, the consequences of a nuclear would be more catastrophic than previously believed. Do you agree with that?

[Kuzin] Absolutely. At the movement's next congress in Moscow I believe we will present our new figures on the medical consequences. I cannot understand the position of certain Western circles which try to downplay the medical and ecological consequences of an exchange of nuclear strikes. The relevant calculations have been done not only in the Soviet Union but in the United States, Canada, and Britain. The figures currently available show the global consequences of a general nuclear war.

BULGARIAN JOURNALIST VISITS SOVIET TEST SITE

AU031505 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 29 Sep 86 pp 1, 7

[Report by Atanas Atanasov, RABOTNICHESKO DELO Moscow correspondent and special correspondent: "The Silent Testing Ground" -- first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] TASS reported 2 days ago that a group of Soviet and foreign correspondents, including some from Western countries, had arrived at the nuclear testing ground near Semipalatinsk in northern Kazakhstan. Among them was our own Moscow correspondent Atanas Atanasov. Today we publish his first report.

Semipalatinsk, 28 September -- At our first meeting at Vnukovo Airport Yuriy Lebedev, the representative of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff who was accompanying the correspondents, remarked: "You will be the first representativews of the mass media to make a kind of landing at this important military installation.... You have the opportunity of seeing that the Soviet Union's nuclear testing site is silent and... possibly of helping to change this silence from a unilateral into a bilateral one."

The "landing" was effected in several stages. The special Aeroflot aircraft took almost 4 hours to cross the three time zones between Moscow and Semipalatinsk. There we were most warmly welcomed by Lieutenant General Arkadiy Ilyenko, the commander of the testing ground. He in his turn described our visit as "an unprecedented event, since this is the first time that journalists set foot on the grounds of the testing site."

The small town is not marked on the map and bears no name. Pehaps this, plus its direct connection with the destructive power of the atom, made us expect something special -- like a battleground -- which distinguishes it from other towns. It turned out that what was "special" was its size, that of a large town, with multistorey apartment blocks buried in greenery created by the hand of man, a true oasis in the wastes of the Kazakh steppe. One of my Western colleagues, in response to his curiosity regarding the size of the population, received the polite answer: "There are as many people as needed to operate the nuclear testing ground in the proper fashion."

Everyone was impressed by the bustling streets and, most of all, by the lively children's playgrounds in the park near the Irtysh River, along the main street named "Academician Kurchatov." One of the buildings bore a memorial plaque, from which we learned that that great Soviet scientist lived and worked there from 1949 to 1956. An impressive commemorative statue has been set up not far away.

The whole appearance of the town creates the impression that the people here are not living "out of suitcases," but are following the rhythm of an intense, but interesting "settled" everyday life. The crucial importance of social, everyday, and cultural conditions for people's life is revealed, no matter where they work or what their jobs are. In the evening we attended a concert in the officers' club. The concert opened with a mixed choir (of a high professional standard) accompanied by the brass band of the military unit, and at the end we also heard the representatives of the up-and-coming generation -- a mixed children's choir.

Early next morning we set off in two M-8 military helicopters in the direction of the testing ground. An hour's journey at this penultimate stage to reach our destination, but, accompanied now by the noise of the engines and different thoughts concerning our forthcoming encounter with the "special" installation, which one instinctively links with the most terrible risk for modern humanity, radiation, the flight seemed to us to be much longer.

We landed at the site where the advance base of the testing ground was situated, consisting of houses and hotels for the scientists and specialists, workers and troops, power-supply facilities, repair shops, stores, and so on. After a further 40-minute journey by bus we found ourselves in a small depression, near which three mountain elevations had, as it were, risen up.

Here I must hasten to admit how primitive my idea of a nuclear testing site was. Who knows why, but in my imagination I connected this concept with the garrison firing range in our town supplemented, naturally, with the bunkers familiar from films about nuclear explosions, with made up a picture of shafts and installations used to conduct nuclear weapon tests, and so on. During the 2 hours that my colleagues and I spent at the Soviet testing site, we learned a lot.

"All the nuclear explosions were carried out here," said Lt Gen Ilyenko, pointing to the circle formed by the ridges of the Gegelen massif. "But why in this region particularly? First, because due to the soil and climatic conditions it is almost unpopulated. Second, geological and hydrological investigations show that this region lacks the subterranean rivers, lakes, and watercourses characteristic of other areas. And third, the Gegelen mountain massif is a unique creation of nature -- the whole massif is, as it were, cast from monolithic, hard granite. The combination of these conditions enables the nuclear tests to be harmless for the environment And, more preisely, they made it possible for the radioactive debris remaining after the nuclear tests conducted deep inside the mountain's rocky bosom to remain there.

Lt Gen Ilyenko then gave us a most detailed briefing on the enormous, difficult, and expensive work that precedes the nuclear tests. First and foremost, a horizontal shaft in the granite massif has to be excavated, 4.5 meters high and 4 meters wide, inside which a narrow-gauge railway has to be laid for the miners' trains. As for the length of the shaft, this is determined by specialists according to the power of the explosion; the more powerful the explosion, the deeper the nuclear charge must be sited in respect of the horizontal and the vertical. This is followed by the most expensive work -- setting up the installations with measuring and other apparatus at the "seat" of the nuclear charge and laying thousands of meters of associated cables to the control center. Finally the shaft-tunnel must be tightly lined, to eliminate the possibility of any small "debris" from the explosion escaping outside by any means whatsoever.

Unexpectedly for most of those present, our host ordered the door of a half-completed shaft to be opened and the lighting to be switched on. Work on this shaft had been halted on 6 August 1985. "Go in, have a good look, take photos," he invited us. Naturally, all of us dived in there. Not everyone managed to reach the bottom of the shaft, at about 400 meters. There indeed one can understand how difficult it is to break up the granite with small explosive charges and to drive the shaft forward. the American TV crew stayed inside the longest of all.

We then inspected a shaft in which cables encased in metal sheaths had been laid. It was explained to us that in this shaft too, which was fully prepared for a nuclear test, only the explosive had not been installed. The shaft had been "frozen" immediately after the declaration of the moratorium in August 1985.

We were given the opportunity to view three shafts fitted with closed, already rusty doors. It has been a long time since the nuclear explosions resounded in these shafts. Anyone who wanted to was invited to venture into it [as published], accompanied, of course, by the lieutenant with a radiation counter. However, no such eager spirits spoke up, but overyone who had a camera took photographs in front of the shafts.

Our visit to the silent Soviet testing ground was exceptionally busy, interesting, and noisy. All of us saw and sensed the silence present there -- a silence which offers and presages calm and peace on earth. Will Nevada respond to this silence? Will their testing ground also fall silent? On this, more than anything else, hangs to fate of world peace and life on earth.

U.S. 'PUSHING' BACTERIOLOGICAL WAR PREPARATIONS

LD041220 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 22 Sep 86

[Text] The United States is pushing through its work on the creation of bacteriological arms. According to the American newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL, the Pentagon has placed orders for the production of the most dangerious Rift Valley fever virus in laboratories of four big American corporations and 24 universities. Altogether the U.S. Defense Department has allocated, in violation of international conventions, a sum of $42 million for work on 57 projects for creating bacteriological means of mass afflication.

Washington tries to cover up its criminal activities by declaring that there is a theoretical basis for that. Bacteriological arms made with the use of the latest technology and without going into heavy expenses my assume an especially important military significance. They are capable of becoming truly great, said the U.S. assistant defense secretary, Douglas Feith, in an interview given to THE WASHINGTON POST. And other Pentagon officials, contrary to logic, declare that bacteriological arms are allegedly elements of America's defense arsenal.

The danger of the experiments conducted by the American military and the fact that they are most certainly not doing this for defense purposes but are seeking ways to speedily and cheaply annihilate whole nations may be judged from many facts. For instance, it is well known that the U.S. Defense Department has been trying hard to use the inhabitants of a number of developing countries as the object of their experiments. Artificially creating hotbeds of infection, the Pentagon bacteriologists are provoking epidemics, haemorrhagic fever in Korea, dengue in Cuba, viral encephalitis in Nicaragua and conjunctivitis in El Salvador. Lately information has been received to the effect that the AIDS virus, which is a syndrome of a deficit of immunity, is also the work of the very same American specialists.

French scientists Jacob and Levi Segal have established that the AIDS virus is an artificial product obtained as a result of manipulations with human genes. In a report distributed in Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe, scientists noted that back in 1977 a center was created at the Fort Detrick base in Maryland state where research was conducted on human beings, prisoners who had received long persion terms. The human guinea pigs were promised to be released if they remained alive. There is evidence, the authors of the document point out, that some of those former prisoners who had survived and were eventually released had become the spreaders of this new disease. Soon the employees of the bacteriological center became convinced that the time required for spreading this virus was insufficiently speedy for military purposes. However, they were already powerless to halt the spreading of the epidemic that had been started.

The version spread by the USA to the effect that the AIDS virus started spreading from Africa, stress Jacob and Levi Segal, is part of a large-scale and racist operation launched for the purpose of hiding the preparations that are going on in the USA for a bacteriological war. There are all indications that the United States Administration, having sanctioned the development of the banned arms, cannot rest in peace over the fact that the Japanese militarists obtained certain successes in this line. For, at the time World War II was ending, a special unit of the Japanese Imperial Army, the notorious Unit Number 731, whose crimes have now been publicized, already possessed stocks of death-dealing bacteria and had sufficient quantities to destroy all of mankind. But the past must not be repeated, and the world must not permit madmen nurturing thoughts of global dominance to once again threaten the world with this horrible weapon whose effects are quite unpredictable.

'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM VIEWS SUMMIT, AFGHANISTAN, PRC

OW061139 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0712 GMT 6 Oct 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello comrades, we are meeting you in Studio 9 at the Ostankino Television Center for a discussion on current world political problems. At the table in Studio 9 today are: Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute, and Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

There is hardly any need to say that the main topic now attracting the attention of people worldwide, irrespective of their political views, is the forthcoming meeting of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan in the Icelandic capital.

Everybody understands that this is a matter of primary political importance and despite the fact that the meeting is qualified as a working one, after all, it is not a matter of terminology, rather the significance lies in the event itself. At the present stage there is a situation which on the one hand opens objective possibilities for reaching agreement on some most important and cardinal problems. On the other hand, there is actual stagnation at the diplomatic talks. These talks are bogged down and this gave rise to the idea of giving new and important impetus to releasing the possibilities existing in the present situation and for moving forward. This is what the meeting will be devoted to. Naturally we shall not forecast results. Yet I think that it is necessary to examine two problems. First, there is the question of the topics which may be discussed -- those that will be discussed -- and the issues which will be faced at the meeting, and second, the general world political background at the time of the coming Soviet-U.S. meeting. I think we shall begin our discussion with this and I shall ask you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, to deal with the issue of the political background.

[Primakov] First of all there is one detail, if it can be called a detail: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal was conveyed to the U.S. side by USSR Foreign Minister Comrade Shevardnadze on 19 September. It took 10 days to get a positive reply to the meeting in Reykjavik. What happened during those 10 days? They were filled with a persistent diplomatic and political struggle by the Soviet Union for constructivism, for summoning constructivism in the American position. Now, during the discussion that went on -- after all the USSR foreign minister sat at the conference table with the U.S. Secretary of State for 25 hours, 25 hours -- and in this struggle I think, this most active work on the part of the Soviet Union, undoubtedly led to definite results. However, a question arises: Where did the difficulties come from, why did the reply not come straight away?

I think two things brought about this difficulty before the United States adopted a political decision. First of all, of course there are now two positions on the main issues of nuclear and space armaments and a gap remains between them.

The second thing is the activity of the forces in the United States that generally come out against any agreement with the Soviet Union and even against talks with the Soviet Union. I think that these forces have on their minds the dispatch of the South Korea aircraft in September 1983, just before the meeting in Madrid when the USSR foreign minister went there to meet with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz.

I think that the same forces have now done their utmost, have taken all steps to undermine any possible constructive agreement. And this was evident from the fact that literally, on the eve of the USSR foreign minister's arrival in New York, Soviet citizen Zakharov, who was working at the United Nations, was arrested and an absolutely unprecedented demand was made for 25 Soviet UN officials to leave New York.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, that is already a peculiarly bad habit. You have recalled the South Korean aircraft incident which occurred during a period of Soviet-U.S. contacts. You have recalled what is happening now. I would like to recall what we all saw in November in Geneva on the eve of Mikhail Sergeyevich's meeting with the President when, literally a few hours before the meeting, Weinberger's provocative letter to the President was produced and was clearly meant to poison the atmosphere of the meeting. Generally you get the impression that every time some contact, some rapprochement of positions, some desire to achieve an agreement is scheduled, these circles come into action and somtimes operate even without the authorities' knowledge. They did not even inform...

[Primakov, interrupting] By the way talking about behind the authorities' backs, the U.S. press writes that President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz did not know about the arrest of Zakharov.

[Zorin] Until the time it happened.

[Primakov] Until the time it happened. At the same time, I would like to limit myself to the parallel between 1983 and the present, between the provocation perpetrated then with the South Korean aircraft and the present actions aimed at undermining the constructive agreement. I am talking about the demand for the expulsion of Soviet personnel and the arrest of a Soviet citizen. Why do I want to draw that parallel? To come to the conclusion that there was an actual meeting between Gromyko and Shultz, but the meeting was very short and was far from constructive in content. As far as the present is concerned despite all efforts to wreck the possibility of an agreement, these forces failed to succeed in their actions. Why did that happen? I would consider three things which seem to me to somewhat promote realism in the American position. First, there is the growing understanding that even if there is a simple extrapolation of the trends developing in international relations -- a simple continuation of these trends -- this may produce a catastrophe. The second thing I would like to draw attention to is the change in public opinion in the United States, and the third thing is the growing discontent on the part of U.S. allies -- of many allies at any rate -- with the absence of constructivism in the U.S. position. Let us be frank and call things by their names. Speaking of public opinion -- I have prepared some statistics here; it is very interesting to compare them. In 1981, over 40 percent of those polled called for cold war against the Soviet Union. More than 40 percent of those polled! At the end of 1985, 74 percent were already in favor of detente in relations with the Soviet Union. In June 1986 THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC News conducted a poll: Americans, by a margin of 61 to 29 percent, were against President Reagan's plan to reject the SALT II treaty and said that the United States should observe its provisions until a new agreement is reached.

Besides, it is very interesting that 53 percent of polled Republicans came out against Reagan's position.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, if you will allow me, I would like to add something ....

[Primakov] Yes, please.

[Zorin] I think you have expressed the very important thought that, normally, you cannot detach foreign from domestic policy, and that the certain shift in the position of the administration's leader has been undoubtedly influenced by the domestic political situation in the country. Those are facts that you mentioned, there is no need to hide them. Not so long ago, a fairly considerable part of U.S. public opinion believed the official propaganda, believed in the myth of the Soviet threat. Some 2 years ago I observed the presidential electoral campaign, and the congressional electoral campaign. I saw the candidates at the time competing with each other in anti-Soviet rhetoric in their pursuit of votes. The harsher the rhetoric, the greater chance there was of getting voters' support. That was the situation then. Now the situation is characterized by the figures you have mentioned.

I shall quote an example: One of the latest anti-Soviet provocations connected with the so-called Daniloff affair was only propaganda hysteria. You get the impression, however, that it was mostly representatives of the Washington political elite who led the propaganda hysteria, while the average American did not react. I would like to quote an example to support this. The Gallup Institute public opinion poll, conducted among a considerable number of Americans, showed that 70 percent of those polled thought that this issue was clearly exaggerated and should in no way hinder the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

I also would like to draw attention to the fact that seldom does Washington listen to the moods of rank and file Americans, the man in the street as they put it there. But now is a special time. Less than a month is left before the general elections. On 4 November there will be congressional and Senate elections and local elections as well. The Republican Party leaders are interested in how the Americans will vote. They do not want to lose their positions in Congress as this will create serious problems for them and will weaken the Republicans' positions in the 1988 presidential elections. One sometimes hears that the meeting in Reykjavik may strengthen the Republicans' positions in the elections.

Well generally this is an American affair. I can only say that, studying the positions of the leaders of both parties, I personally cannot find any special difference between these positions, including their positions on Soviet-U.S. relations. So it is their business. Let them sort it out themselves. But the fact that the situation has changed in the country -- has changed as a result of Soviet actions, especially the moratorium which has made a great impression on the ordinary American -- is a fact that also has a definite influence on U.S. actions in the foreign policy arena.

[Primakov] First a few words about public opinion. You see, the decisions adopted in America are those which are advantageous to those groups in the ruling class in power. While accepting this fact, we must in no way underrate the effect of public opinion in the United States or in the West in general, and in the adoption of political decisions as well. Let us ask ourselves the question whether there is any point otherwise in manipulating public opinion if it plays no role at all? In the West they try to manipulate it in every possible way and this is done by the very circles that make foreign policy decisions.

I think that the strength of our proposals -- and you have already started speaking about it -- lies precisely in the fact that after the April Plenum we started paying considerably more attention to public opinion in the West then we did before. That could be so, right? Well, I would like to say something else. It is a fact that public opinion is changing. That is a difficult process. There are still all sorts of incorrect views of our policy. All sorts of myths are widely spread. Although they have been undermined lately, they are still sufficiently firm.

The fact that public opinion is changing and that the attitude of the U.S. allies' toward our actions is changing shows absolutely the result of the line adopted at the April Party Central Committee Plenum, which was developed, reflected, and supported in the materials of the 27th Congress of our party. This could be called an escalation of the peaceful proposals of the Soviet Union. They play their role, and there is no escaping them. They are producing results. Their results are in the changes we observe.

[Zhurkin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I would like to focus our analysis of the situation before Reykjavik precisely from this point of view, from the point of the real changes that have taken place. It is necessary to calmly and soberly evaluate those changes, without overrating or underrating them. The first of those changes is of course Stockholm, the Stockholm Conference on Measures or Strengthening Confidence, Security, and Cooperation in Europe. By the way, remember Geneva. In the joint statement after the Geneva summit meeting considerable attention was paid to the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States should and must contribute to the successful completion of the Stockholm conference.

What has happened? A whole package of unique decisions has been adopted. For the first time a decision was made on the need to report troop movements in Europe, like from the United States to Europe. That did not exist before. For the first time an agreement was reached on the provisions for local inspection of various military exercises. For the first time an agreement was reached on the mandatory invitation of observers to military exercises. For the first time an agreement was reached on exchanging plans for military actions subject to reporting. For the first time we have even to some extent started limiting military exercises. I think these are five firsts. In the past, each one of these could have been a topic for an independent and fairly serious international agreement.

[Zorin interrupts] And it is very important that the possibility of reaching such important agreements at present was demonstrated.

[Zhurkin] Yes, this too, and again I would like to stress the point that we do not talk sufficiently about the importance of Stockholm. Apparently to some extent we are restrained by the fact that no real reductions have been effected. And, really, there has not bee a reduction in numbers of a single soldier, a single tank, or a single aircraft. But military activities are being limited and, what seems to me to be even more important, is that serious steps have been made to prevent the danger of sudden attack in Europe. This danger has always worried and will continue to worry Soviet people. We always remeber the past. We always remember history.

It is not only the Stockholm conference. At the Geneva summit meeting there was talk about intensifying the work of the IAEA -- the International Atomic Energy Agency. Recently a very important IAEA conference was held in Vienna. A convention on improving safety in the use of nuclear energy was signed.

At the Geneva summit meeting it was said that it is necessary to make progress toward prohibiting chemical weapons. There has been some progress in chemical weapons talks, and in the nonproliferation of chemical weapons.

[Primakov interrupts] And of course the most important thing is our moratorium, which has been extended four times. I think it has had the greatest effect on the public.

[Zhurkin] It seems to me, Yengeniy Maksimovich, that the main thing is that there is a whole package of unilateral actions like our moratorium, and bilateral and multilateral agreements. Of course we have to be realists. We must not look at all this as would a (?pariah), or through rose-colored glasses. As you mentioned at the very beginning, the main and more major issues of limiting and reducing armaments are still deadlocked, and yet even there the matter is progressing on some areas, though with difficulty.

Summing it all up, I would say that the program for consolidating peace and security outlined in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 15 January statement this year and approved by our 27th Congress has begun functioning literally before our very eyes, over the last few weeks.

[Primakov interrupts] You know...

[Zhurkin] You know it has started moving. You can feel it; the process has begun.

[Primakov] You know, I would offer the following formula. On the one hand there are of course very serious deadlocks in the main issues and actually the existence of these deadlocks has led to the need for this meeting in Reykjavik. If they did not exist, if everything progressed satisfactorily, there would have been no need for the meeting. Right? I want to stress that the deadlocks are on the main, cardinal issues. On the other hand, the very fact the Americans agreed to the meeting is already a result of the great work carried out by our country over the last period.

[Zorin] And now I would like to ask a question which I fully understand is easier to ask than to answer. Nevertheless I would like you, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, to give your opinion as a specialist who has studied Soviet-U.S. relations for many years. What can the forthcoming Reykjavik meeting produce?

[Zhurkin] I shall tell you frankly, Valentin Sergeyevich, that my first wish is to avoid answering this question.

[Zorin interrupts] But the question has been asked.

[Zhurkin] Because it is really very difficult to make predictions, and the event itself, this meeting in Reykjavik, has come up so quickly and very suddenly. It has been a surprise to many; there is no need to conceal that. It seems to me there is another very important thing to note. Each side involved in such a meeting naturally tries to formulate its maximum position, tries to make the fullest statement. In the course of compromises and to achieve agreements, you have to retreat in some areas, and make a change for another change in the position of the other side. That is a natural diplomatic process.

Nevertheless, I think that we should begin at least by talking about the topics, the major problems that may be discussed. I think there can be different criteria here. First of all you may discuss and evaluate the scale of these problems. You may evaluate them from the point of view of the feasibility of solving this or that problem. Finally, you can talk about the topics according to how acutely we perceive them. Beginning with the last criterion, I would like to express a kind of wish, if you will, that the United States come to join us in ending nuclear testing, the moratorium, the agreement -- or in beginning work on an agreement -- on a treaty for a complete ban on nuclear tests. It seems to me that we have talked about the subject, but there is need to return to it. Whatever the fate of ou moratorium, it has already gone down in history as a selfless step by the Soviet Union. Already that selfless step has substantially changed many things in present-day international relations.

Talking about the most major issues, these of course are the problems of nuclear and space nuclear armaments reduction and preventing the arms race in space. The positions are known. The Soviet Union has proposed several options for reduction of nuclear strategic armaments and has proposed the 50 percent option for reducing nulcear means capable of reaching each other's territory. The United States is not ready to accept this. A project called the 30 percent option in the West with a one-third reduction has been offered. It seems to me that we find unsuitable much being offered by the United States. Again there are tricks, again there is the tendency not to discuss trends hwere the Americans expect to move a long way ahead and try to put more pressure on the Soviet Union. On the whole there is still considerable work to be done and hard struggle lies ahead in this main sphere. The problem of preventing the arms race in space is of course among the most difficult. Unfortunately...

[Primakov interrupts] It is the most important one.

[Zhurkin] Yes and difficult. Unfortunately the United States is not moving forward in this really most important sphere. I cannot seriously accept the U.S. proposal that we pretend for 7 and 1/2 years to observe the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems then decide now that we shall bury it in 7 and 1/2 years.

[Zorin interrupts] Moreover since they cannot do this earlier than 7 years from now, it is precisely the period of time they need to introduce it all.

[Zhurkin] Yes. Valentin Sergeyevich, I especially said pretend for in actual fact from the very beginning they propose that this agreement be violated. So what do they propose that they be allowed to do? Not only the conduct laboratory research, but to implement experimental designs and carry out field tests. Even tests in space, tests that completely contradict the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems. Generally the situation here is difficult, although I should say that here the Soviet Union has done a great deal. First of all the Soviet Union has taken a very important unilateral action -- although we say rather little about it -- and that is that for the past 3 years the Soviet Union has not tested antisatellite systems. This moratorium has been in effect for 3 years. This is a very important matter.

There are also other Soviet proposals. It has proposed a ban on space strike weapons, and a ban on antimissile weapons. The Soviet Union went along with the United States in its interim proposal and agreed that the sides could carry out laboratory research, although frankly speaking, I consider that we should favor a complete ban on any research aimed at implementing anything that would lead to a subsequent arms race in space. We took positive steps.

Many people in the West recognize that the Soviet Union has an obvious desire and an obvious wish to reach agreement on these issues. If we talk about the issues with the best prospects, well both the United States and our side consider the intermediate-range missiles issue to be the most promising. Here too the Soviet Union has made a proposal consisting of many options. There is our proposal to reduce to zero the number of the U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in Europe and to destroy all these Soviet and American missiles. The Americans are not ready to accept this. The Soviet Union has shown willingness to agree to some interim agreement in this sphere and the United States too has made some interim proposals. In fact it is difficult to discuss these issues because talks are underway. Talks are underway.

Nevertheless, this direction appears to be really promising. Now what do we want from the meeting in Reykjavik? We want achievement of a political accord and it would be even better if a draft agreement was worked out or the drafting of an agreement was begun. Even on one major issue of arms limitation and reduction. Better still on two.

[Primakov interrupts] Better still on three. [laughs]

[Zhurkin] Better still on three. Now you will notice that responses have been voiced in various foreign countries, the positive of our allies, as well as the allies of the United States. If you read attentitively the responses of say the governments of the FRG, the United Kingdom, Italy, and others, all of them are couched in various forms but they have a common line nothing that they want concrete results, they would like concrete results. This is precisely the previous and present position of the Soviet Union.

[Primakov] Now you know Vitaliy Vladimirovich what I would like to emphasize is that we are not talking about a surrender of some positions that could generally weaken the defense capability of the Soviet Union. We wre talking about a maximum use of a sufficient existing balance [maksimalnoye ispolzovaniye dostatochnosti balansa sushchestvuyushchego] and, in the framework of this, about a maximum constructivism that will help reach agreement on lowering the level of this balance -- if we outline things in this schematic way.

[Zhurkin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, it seems to me -- I agree with you -- that you have touched on a very important aspect, because, well I would approach this from another side. Sometimes people say: How is it that the Soviet Union has proposed all these positions, yet when the final agreement is concluded it lacks this, includes that only partly.... Well comrades, after all, throughout the history of arms limitation and reduction talks there has never been an occasion in which the initial position of either side has eventually become an greement. This is hard work, the achievement of compromises where not everything can fit. Some things remain for further consideration at subsequent stages. The main thing lies in the fact that there must be a principle, the main fundamental points must be preserved.

Now these points of principle are elementary. Arms must be reduced, and the more the better.

[Primakov] If we talk about the wisdom of our position, I think it lies in the fact that it takes into consideration our need to full maintain the security of the Soviet Union, and under these conditions it makes maximum use of all the reserves available for a compromise on these conditions. Now if we talk for instance on how successful we are in this field, -- and this has been especially evident lately -- let us take the issue of control for instance.

We all remember well when we were accused of being a closed state and of not providing an opportunity for verification as provided for in the existing agreement, and of not wanting verification, and so forth. When we confidently proceeded with the following measure, when we said: Let us conclude an agreement and we shall have no problem at all with verification, when we took practical steps and agreed the Americans could now be present near Semipalatinsk, near...

[Zorin interrupts] Washington retreated.

[Primakov] Washington retreated. Washington immediately retreated. Besides, you see how this happened. It appeared that we agreed. We agreed and the Americans once again felt that reliable inspection can be achieved with national means of verification, because they registered their explosions in the State of Nevada on their equipment, right? In the Nevada desert. Under these conditions, when our scientists wanted to go there, they refused. So there is the American position.

[Zorin] I would like to continue with this topic. We have already referred to this tradition, to the attempt to complicate the situation on the eve of Soviet-American meetings. This is being done now, as we have said. All kinds of rumors and gossip are put to use. Some observers are now trying to discuss whose victory it is, this agreement to meet in Reykjavik. Who made a compromise? In other words, they are poisoning the atmosphere in every way, not only with rumors but also with a whole series of actions carried out by the Pentagon. Take the latest explosion in Nevada, tests of new types of weapons, and the appearance of U.S. ships near Soviet shores. All these are definite actions and in this connection I would like to ask the question: What difficulties do you see now on the eve of the Soviet-American meeting?

[Zhurkin] If we want to talk about difficulties we have to return to what we said at the very beginning of our discussion, our dialogue. There are real and sufficiently influential forces in the United States which want to oppose an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, and which even struggle against the holding of summit meetings themselves. There are powerful organizations like the Heritage Foundation, the American Security Council, there are groups in the U.S. Congress. Congressman Jack Kemp for instance is one of the 1988 presidential candidates. He has already rushed to condemn the changes that have taken place. Many others have also spoken out. Henry Kissinger could not refrain and complained from his New York corner that decisions are being made too hastily, that more caution is needed.

[Primakov interrupts] I think that if he had taken part in formulating the decision he would have spoken differently.

[Zhurkin] Possibly. I watched the first press conference of the President and secretary of state when they made the announcement about Reykjavik. Just take a look at the questions asked by some correspondents: I get the impression -- and if I am wrong please tell me so -- that the United States has given up some positions during these talks; why has your policy changed; why have you changed your opinion, all year you spoke against the idea of holding a meeting in some neutral country; what will you answer to those who say that you have lost; (?what are the prospects?)

[Zorin interrupts] The questions addressed to Shultz were an attempt to hurt his pride, an attempt to poison the atmsophere, to force him to justify himself. Of course this...

[Zhurkin interrupts] Of course, and to reestablish the spirit of confrontation, intransigence.

[Zorin] Yes. This reflects the position of very definite circles, that is not a journalist's position. They are somebody's mouthpiece.

[Zhukin] I have to say, Valentin Sergeyevich, I think that both the President and secretary of state gave appropriate answers to these questions by saying that it was a matter of compromise, that there had been concessions on both sides. Shultz got angry and said: Gentlemen we are talking about serious and major issues and not playing hide and seek, so do not push us in that direction.

[Primakov] You have seen the opposing forces in Congress, journalistic circles, and in the military-industrial complex. But it has to be said that they also exist within the administration itself. You have already recalled Weinberger's letter before the Geneva meeting which was intended to wreck the possibility of the very meeting. So there are people active in the administration, too. Of course this is the main difficulty that will have to be overcome.

[Zorin] Well, there are difficulties but the process is underway. The meeting in Reykjavik itself should, according to the ideas of its organizers, pave the way to a new USSR-U.S. summit meeting, which was agreed on in Geneva.

But now I would like to focus the attention of our television viewers on another problem. I recall that prior to the meeting in Geneva one of the methods used to somehow devalue the meeting, to divert it from the main problems, was an attempt to put so-called regional issues in the forefront instead of the problems of disarmament and control in these most important spheres, and to set off one group of problems against another. Yevgeniy Maksimovich, how do things stand today?

[Primakov] Well you know it seems to me that there is an agreement to discuss the main problems in Reykjavik; and the main problems, we naturally all consider them to be problems related to the need to end the arms race which is leading mankind and all civilization to damnation, so to speak. If we talk about regional problems, on the one hand I would be categorically opposed to having them set off against something and, on the other hand, they are extremely significant and naturally we cannot evade this fact too.

A series of conflicts exists in various regions of the world. Besides, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev appealed for a completely objective approach to them so that they would not be viewed only through a prism of Soviet-American contradictions; so these conflicts would be viewed as a manifestation of and as a result of a whole series and a whole system of objective problems existing in various parts of the world, including social, economic, and political problems. These conflicts are developing and the most dangerous thing is that they are spreading beyond their regional boundaries. They can lead to an international explosion and can act as detonators that can explode the entire international situation.

One of the directions of our policy -- the policy of the Soviet Union -- one of the main directions I would say, is a movement toward liquidation of these conflicts. As the USSR foreign minister has emphasized, we have shown fresh approaches to these conflicts and conflicting situations and naturally this topic will probably be raised, or at least it can be raised in Reykjavik.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, there is a whole series of regional conflicts that play a considerable role in events, but I would like you to dwell in particular on events in Afghanistan.

[Primakov] I would even call it the conflict around Afghanistan, not so much in Afghanistan, although of course a conflict does exist in Afghanistan. Now, generallly, an issue is made of the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and it is put at the center of the entire problem. I think this question was predetermined when the Soviet contingent was brought in. We immediately said that we are doing this on a temporary basis and that we will withdraw our troops.

Our television viewers know perfectly well that, speaking in Vladivostok, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that six regiments would be withdrawn by the end of this year. I think their withdrawal will begin in the nearest future.

But this is the problem: There are two practical possibilities. The first possibility is that USSR troops will be withdrawan -- and this has been declared by Soviet leaders, has been declared repeatedly -- if a system of international guarantees is set up against the interference of antigovernment forces from outside, mainly from Pakistani and Iranian territory. Then the troops can be withdrawn as soon as agreement on these guarantees is reached.

There is also another possibility, and this is that they will be withdrawn one way or the other if the situation in Afghanistan is stabilized through the efforts of the Afghan people who the Soviet contingent is assisting. Now stabilization in Afghanistan is occurring. It is occuring through the broadening of the Afghan regime's social base. In a recently published interview, the general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan said that in the past 4 months 3,000 former dushmans laid down their arms. They came in and expressed their readiness to cooperate with the new regime. Talks are presently under way with 92 gangs that number another 6,000 armed men. The revolutionary council includes two former gang leaders who decided to cooperate with the people's power and are honestly cooperating with it.

The social and political basis of the regime is expanding through the interaction of all the elements that are prepared to cooperate with the people's authorities. This is leading to stabilization. Another point that leads to stabilization is that the Afghan Army and the security forces are undoubtedly acquiring increasing strength and are gaining increasing popular support.

So in either case the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan. But they could be withdrawn sooner if a corresponding system of international guarantees is drawn up and an agreement on this system concluded. This is the main thing and it can be seen with the naked eye. There is no need to scrutinize it under a microscope.

The United States is doing everything in its power to prevent us from withdrawing our troops from Afghanistan, everything possible. It would seem to be as paradox. The U.S. says that it wants us to withdraw from Afghanistan but in reality it is doing everything possible to make our troops remain there. First of all, it is supplying the latest weapons to the dushmans...

[Zorin interrupts] They finance them.

[Primakov] To the bandits. It organizes them and participates in their organization and finances them. Furthermore, I think there must be some U.S. influence involved when, just as Pakistan draws a little closer to the Afghan position during talks in Geneva, it suddenly rejects its previously adopted positions. I think the hand of Washington can be seen in this, too.

[Zorin] In the context of the problems we are discussing, I would like you, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, to dwell in the problem of Soviet-Chinese relations, insofar as they are most directly related to this topic.

[Zhurkin] It is undoubtedly, Valentin Sergeyevich, I agree, because normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is a factor in international stability, and the role of this factor is growing.

Let us recall the relatively recent past. One of the main things U.S. hawks counted on was bringing China over to their camp. [privyazat kitay k svoyey kolensnitse]. An unsavory expression, the China card, came into use. After all, it is insulting to the billion-strong people who have a most ancient history. Besides, they already have intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear charges.

Today it is obvious to the United States that the China card did not work. I have here a very interesting quotation from a relatively recent report of the Heritage Foundation -- the ideological center of ultra-right wing forces. Here is what the report says: To use the China card, in other words to attempt to attempt to use China to defeat the Soviet Union, is unrealistic. It should be admitted that Washington has very little influence on the relations between the two communist giants. It should be expected that there will be further improvement in relations between Beijing and Moscow, although there will still be difficulties in them.

It seems that right wing or ultra-right wing officials are even gloating somewhat when they say this, because they also dislike People's China. We are not the only ones they dislike. Now, in talking about this situation I think it should be noted that the policy of the 12th CPC Congress, a policy of self-reliance and independence in foreign policy, of ensuring favorable external conditions for the PRC's economic and political development, plays a growing role in the PRC's foreign policy. Now, as far as our country is concerned, we reiterated loudly at the 27th Congress that we favor normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations.

[Zorin] In Vladivostok, too, Mikhail Sergeyevich emphasized this most manifestly and clearly.

[Zhurkin] Yes, and this was received positively in the PRC. In other words there is already a bilateral nature to this process. It seems to me that normalization of our relations with the PRC is an action on our and the Chinese part. It seems...

[Primakov interrupts] Just recently, excuse me...

[Zhurkin] Please.

[Primakov] Recently Deng Xiaoping spoke and said he was prepared to reverse his initial ban and to visit the USSR if the USSR influences Vietnam to withdraw its troops from Cambodia. Now Mikhail Sergeyevich in his Vladivostok speech said that the Soviet Union is ready to meet an any level. But he made no conditions when he said this. He set no conditions.

[Zhurkin] Well, let us apply the entire spectrum of relations to our and the PRC's relations with the United States. It seems to me that a normalization of relations makes it easier for us, too, to carry on our affairs with the United States as we want to, and for the PRC to carry on its affairs with the United States.

In general I think the international situation can only benefit if a normalization of relations occurs along all the lines of this Moscow-Beijing-Washington triangle. It can only be beneficial.

[Primakov] You know that, nevertheless, when you study Soviet-U.S. relations and Soviet relations with others in the capitalist world, with developing countries and socialist countries, of course naturally, and so forth, Soviet-U.S. relations play a huge role because 93, 95, 97 percent -- the statistics vary here -- consider that as the Soviet Union and the United States hold nuclear missiles, the prospects for peace depend on their relations more than on anything else.

At the same time it does not follow that we underrate our relations with other countries. Our relations with the socialist countries are of primary importance. First of all this is reflected in all our documents. At the same time our relations with Japan, Western Europe and others are also of great importance. Moreover I think that this multilateral political line for normalizing and expanding our relations with all these countries...

[Primakov interrupts] That is, the 27th Congress policy.

[Zhurkin] This 27th Congress policy contributes to our progress in relations with the United States.

[Zorin] I think that the very tangible progress, the forward movement in these bilateral relations among the Soviet Union and many countries is a very important circumstance in the present international situation and is an important factor in connection with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

[Primakov] There is no doubt.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has repeatedly and very persistently stressed and continues to stress the need to solve the problems which now face mankind with new thinking, the need to reject the usual political stereotypes, to make a revolutionary leap in thinking, in the actions of responsible statesmen of the present, and their ability to adapt to present and completely new and unique political realities. In this connection I would like to ask you whether it is possible, in light of the latest events which we talk about today, to say that this new thinking is beginning to germinate among our partners. What do you think?

[Zhurkin] Well I think that -- I shall be cautious about it -- there is a definite readiness for political solutions. We have already mentioned that there are internal factors which move the United States, there are external factors, there is a definite readiness, and there are definite changes. Of course with all that readiness, the U.S. leadership, the U.S. Administration will persistently strive to secure its own interests; otherwise they would not be Americans now when stubborn work makes it possible and will make it possible to secure on an equal basis their interests, and the interests of mankind in general, there will be progress and agreements. I think that despite the cautiousness of this evaluation it would be incorrect to disregard certain political interests.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, what do you think?

[Primakov] You know, there is no doubt that political interests do exist. But I would not link them with the emergence of strong, new political thinking. I think...

[Zhurkin interrupts] I did not say that.

[Primakov] At any rate I would put it somewhat differently. I would say that no new U.S. political thinking has been noted, unfortunately.

[Zorin interrupts] There is the pressure of circumstances.

[Primakov] That is how I see it, because what is new thinking, after all? How does Comrade Gorbachev postulate the problem? It lies in the fact that there are completely new approaches to the concept of security, new approaches to the process of normalization of relations, and entirely new approaches to the process that exists in the developing world and so forth. In this sense there is no new thinking yet, but it is our task to introduce this new thinking at all levels, as they say, at all levels.

I think there is very much promoting this matter, and first of all it is promoted of course by a mutual understanding. Only the blind can fail to see where the development of the world can lead to today if this new political thinking is not introduced. This new understanding will inevitably be acquired. Then again everybody is trying to promote this matter. In connection with this in my view our soccer players did not play their 1-1 tie game in Reykjavik in vain, because thereby they wanted to introduce new prospects for the summit meeting. [laughs]

[Zorin] To promote a good atmosphere.

[Primakov] Yes, to promote a good atmosphere.

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you wanted to say something.

[Zhurkin] I wanted to say, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, that nevertheless it should not be forgotten that we are communists and they are capitalists.

[Primakov interrupts] Well [words indistinct]

[Zhurkin] We, in striving for a new thinking, must perceive realistically what can or cannot be expected. I think that in making very realistic proposals, exhibiting dynamism, a desire for compromise, and increasing its activity the Soviet Union naturally somehow creates more favorable conditions for those germs of political realism which, it seems to me, are slowly emerging.

[Zorin] The fact that this new thinking in new conditions has been manifested primarily by political figures armed with Marxist-Leninist theory is completely natural and this could not be otherwise. But realities exist in the world today which also influence those who sit on the other side of the conference table, and it is these realities that the leaders of Soviet policy count on when they call for new thinking. They do not proceed from utopian desires but from these realities.

Now if we talk about whether or not the germs of a new thinking are sprouting right now at this stage, not in some future, then I think it will be easier for us to answer this question not on the eve of Reykjavik but after Reykjavik when we will probably gather here to discuss these problems and then the question will become clear. One thing is sure -- objective requirements exist relating to the problem of mankind's survival. This will not come unaided. It can be achieved by difficult, stubborn, persistent work and struggle that is being waged by the Soviet state and by its leadership.

It is quite obvious that the Soviet Union, true to its peace-loving policy has defended and defends the interests of peace on earth. This is our ideology, this is our constitutional principle -- we are marking Soviet Constitution day right now -- and it is the general line of Soviet foreign policy.

I think that we will conclude our talk with this today. It remains for me to thank you my colleagues for your participation and to thank our television viewers. And so until we meet again here in our Studio 9, thank you.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD032007 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 3 Oct 86

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Konstantin Patsyok, All-Union Radio commentator, with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; Viktor Levin, commentator; Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer; Pavel Kasparov, commentator, and Sergey Pravdin, not further identified]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Greetings, esteemed comrades. I would like to start off our broadcast today, which as usual is compiled on the basis of listeners' Letters, with an event which you know about, of course, comrades, from reports in our press and on radio and television. Understanding has been reached on a meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. As previously announced, this meeting will take place on 11-12 October in Reykjavik.

Speaking in Moscow at a meeting devoted to the solemn unveiling of a statue to Ernst Thaelmann, leader of the German Communist Party, consistent internationalist, Comrade Gorbachev noted that our proposal to Reagan to hold a -- so to speak -- working meeting has just one aim: to begin at last to implement our understandings with the U.S. President which we reached in Geneva. I believe, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, that this is fully in accord with the interests of both the Soviet and the U.S. people and all the people of the world.

In recent months our listeners have very often asked about the new soviet-U.S. summit, whether it would take place and if so, when. Now there is an accord on an extraordinary [neocherodnoy] working meeting. We have invited to our studio political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin. What would you say about this?

[Shishlin] I think, first of all of course, that one must differentiate between the meeting which is to take place in Reykjavik and the meeting on which understanding was reached between ourselves and the United States in Geneva.

I would say that the meeting in Reykjavik could be a springboard, a bridge, to that summit meeting which should discuss cardinal problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and the most important questions connected with ensuring international security.

The question arises as to why there is any need for an interim meeting, and why it is not possible to meet straight away on U.S. territory. Here, we must return to what has taken place throughout the 9 months of 1986. You know that the USSR has not wasted this time. A whole complex of Soviet initiatives aimed at reducing the level of military confrontation and at solving cardinal problems connected with consolidating peace, is still lying on the negotiating table and these questions, raised by the USSR, are under discussion at various forums. Over the last 9 months we have been amassing a peace potential. We have accumulated a quantity which, I think, is gradually beginning to transform into quality.

This aspect was pointed out by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. He spoke of the positive results of the Stockholm conference and of the successful work of the IAEA where measures were worked out jointly with other countries to ensure the safety of nuclear power engineering. And, of course, everything that has happened over the last few weeks in New York -- all of these meetings with representatives of many and varied states -- they showed that the world has a common interest. This is the interest in the consolidation of security, and the interest in solving urgent international problems.

[Patsyuk] How has the United States acted during this period?

[Shishlin] As far as the United States actions are concerned we shall be frank. These actions have deserved, to put it mildly, rather severe criticism. In many respects the United States has, as it were, moved away from what was agreed at Geneva. Various rightwing circles in the United States seem to have deliberately created obstacles to try to prevent a new Soviet-U.S. summit taking place, a summit which would produce strong results and major decisions.

It was for that reason that the USSR put forward the initiative to hold an interim meeting with just one aim: to achieve the creation of the conditions and the atmosphere which would allow the holding of a broad Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, to continue the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and to fill it with a rich and profound content. This is the significance of Reykjavik.

In my opinion it is simply too early today to say what questions will be discussed at Reykjavik and what the results of Reykjavik will be. The USSR, as shown not by its words but by its actions, even though the necessary words have also been uttered, will of course strive to ensure that Reykjavik gives the green light for a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. And, of course, the USSR will strive to ensure that Reykjavik gives a strong impulse for progress to be made at all talks concerning the problems of curbing armaments, primarily nuclear armaments, and problems connected with the halting of nuclear weapons tests. Of course also we have our eyes on other problems which today complicate the state of international affairs.

[Patsyuk] Nikolay Vladimirovich, in your opinion how will events develop?

[Shishlin] Well, there is no need to guess what will happen if Reykjavik ends with just a plus sign. In that case, there will be a new Soviet-U.S. meeting.

Then we will find that Reykjavik has cleared away the obstacles and that, generally, opportunities will open up for a serious and profound change in the development of international relations in favor of detente, in favor the development of the process of detente and the involvement in this process not only of the USSR, and the United States, of course, but also of the European states, the countries of the Third World, and Japan. We shall then be able to say that the process of detente is becoming worldwide and that detente has a very serious foundation.

[passage omitted: Levin on questions of Germans' attitude to Nuremberg trials; Kornilov on violations of civil rights in United States; Patsyuk on history of Greenpeace actions against nuclear tests; Kasparov answers questions about role of UNESCO and its history; Patsyuk on U.S. sanctions against South Africa; Pravdin on results of the recent Japanese parliamentary elections]

[Patsyuk] Viktor Pavlovich Vorobyev from the town of Shuya, Ivanovo Oblast, asks about the border procedures between the capital of the GDR and West Berlin. You probably know, that previously, until 13 August 1961, the border between the capital of the GDR and West Berlin was virtually open. At that time it was used by various intelligence and subversive centers based in the Western sectors of Berlin which organized provocations against the German socialist state.

Much has changed since then. The GDR has adopted measures to intensify the guarding and checks on the border, thus defending its sovereignty. The building of the Berlin Wall, as some people in the West like to call it, did not become an obstacle for normal contacts between people of West Berlin and democratic Berlin. There is a system of crossing-points that made it possible for the inhabitants to visit each other. And the flow of visitors is not only not diminishing but its increasing. Judge for yourself: Whereas in 1971 about 100,000 West Berliners visited the GDR, in 1985 about 1.8 million inhabitants of West Berlin visited it.

One of the major passenger crossing points in West Berlin is at Friedrichstrasse station of the Berlin urban railway. The checking system is very simple. Anyone who comes to the station with the appropriate documents leaves the carriage, goes down to the crossing point and presents his documents. Then, after normal formalities he climbs up, literally, to the next platform on the other side of the barrier. Every day the border between the GDR and West Berlin is crossed by up to 70,000-80,000 people.

But such border procedures are apparently not to the liking of right wing and revanchist forces who recently, on the 25th anniversary of the date when the GDR took protective border measures, organized a provocative outburst at this crossing point. It was only thanks to the self-possession of the border guards that it was thwarted. Some people would like to return to the times when Berlin was a frontline city. Such strivings are in vain. [passage omitted: Patsyuk replies to a question on the Army of South Lebanon; Patsyuk on stabilization process in the Philippines under President Aquino; Patsyuk on role of the Salvation Army in the U.S.]

CSCE PREPARATORY MEETING ENDS, ENVOY COMMENTS

LD062112 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT 6 Oct 86

[Text] Vienna October 6 TASS -- The preparatory meeting of representatives of state-participants in the Conference for European Security and Cooperation has closed here today. Its participants have discussed questions on the agenda and the organisational-procedural aspects of the third meeting of representatives of the countries-participants in the conference scheduled to open in Vienna on November 4, this year. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have put forward proposals directed at creating by joint efforts optimum conditions for effective work of the forthcoming meeting. NATO members countries, which originally advanced proposals that did not correspond to the objectives of the Vienna meeting, have agreed to the adoption of a compromise decision. Neutral and non-aligned countries have made a substantial contribution to the quest for mutually acceptable decisions reaffirming their wish to strengthen the all-European process, which was started at Helsinki eleven years ago. The preparatory meeting has adopted a document determining the procedure and other of holding the third meeting of representatives of the states-participants in the conference on European security and cooperation.

Ambassador at large Igor Andropov, head of the Soviet delegation, told a TASS correspondent that the preparatory meeting in common with the conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament, which closed in Stockholm, had borne out that "if there is goodwill and wish, the countries-participants in the all-European process can find useful decisions meeting their mutual interests".

"A way has been opened here in Vienna for the forthcoming third meeting to become another important milestone in Europe's advancement towards reliable security, towards improving European cooperation.

"We are now all looking forward to the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik. I can say that that meeting is already working towards improving the political climate. Representatives of 35 states undoubtedly link their hopes for a better future with the Reykjavik meeting. Guided by that, they engaged themselves in a search for mutually acceptable decisions and agreements".

IAEA CONFERENCE SESSION CLOSES IN VIENNA 3 OCT

LD040645 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Text] Vienna October 3 TASS -- The general conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) ended a regular session here today after passing a number of resolutions, including one condemning South Africa for building up its nuclear potential with the aim of producing nuclear weapons of its own, which would pose a grave threat to international peace and security. The attendees, representing some 100 countries and 25 international organizations, endorsed guidelines for the agency's activities in 1987, stressing the need to step up efforts to provide a reliable regime for the further development of the nuclear power industry. They denounced the aggressive policy of Israel and its unwillingness to open its nucleare facilities to IAEA control. They also pointed to the importance of increasing the IAEA's role in preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons.

REAGAN OUTLINES APPROACH TO REYKJAVIK PARLEY

LD071200 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1102 GMT 7 Oct 86

["President Reagan's Speech" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, 7 October (TASS) -- President R. Reagan has spoken in the White House, outlining the U.S. approach to the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik on 11-12 October. He stressed the importance of the dialogue between the leaders of the two countries, admitting that this dialogue "can further the prevention of war" through a discussion of arms control issues and other acute international problems. "I hope that these talks will be useful and successful," added the President.

At the same time, Reagan noted that the meeting in Reykjavik is of a preliminary nature and, from the U.S. viewpoint, is to serve as preparation for the forthcoming visit to the United States by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He pointed out that its participants face "serious and complex problems," warned against excessive optimism regarding the prospects for solving them, and spoke of the inappropriateness, as he put it, of "the false and unjustified hopes being placed on the talks in Iceland."

At the same time, the President made it clear that the United States intends to touch on the habitual anti-Soviet themes and does not intend to decline from interfering in the affairs of Afghanistan and other sovereign states. He justified the illegal U.S. demand for the reduction of the number of Soviet UN employees and extolled the former U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT magazine correspondent in Moscow, N. Daniloff, who was thrown out of the Soviet Union for unlawful activity.

SHISHLIN: MEETING TO GIVE 'STRONG STIMULUS' TO SUMMIT

LD061255 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Oct 86

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Nikolay Agayants; Nikolay Shishlin commentary]

[Text] The meeting in Reykjavik planned for 11-12 October this year will take place, as is known, at the initiative of the Soviet side. International journalist Nikolay Shishlin will speak in more detail about this. Please go ahead Nikolay Vladimirovich.

[Shishlin] In fact it was the Soviet Union which proposed the holding of this meeting, and the U.S. Administration and the U.S. President in person accepted this proposal.

What dictated the Soviet initiative, in particular since, in general, a full-scale Soviet-U.S. meeting has not been removed from the agenda and it is called upon to bring substantive results -- is the cause of consolidating international security. The thing is that for 9 months of 1986 all kinds of obstacles have in fact been building up in the path of a full-scale Soviet-U.S. summit. And the main thing is that there was no perceptible progress in resolving the key issues connected with consolidating international security. And thus, in this sense, the purpose of the Reykjavik meeting is to give a strong stimulus -- yes, so that a Soviet-U.S. summit will be a successful, serious, and business-like one.

But, since we are now speaking of the forthcoming conversations in Reykjavik, we should understand that all the same, the known basis of the meeting are those profound processes which have been developing in international relations. In this connection one should note that not only the Soviet and American peoples are interested in the success of this meeting. Also interested in the success of this meeting are the partners of the United States, our allies, the Nonaligned Movement has an interest, in essence the entire world community.

One feels that in itself the Soviet Union's political baggage requires no commentaries. The Soviet Union not only calls for a move from words to deeds. The Soviet Union is itself providing an example of political good will and is taking action.

All this, of course, does not make the path to Reykjavik and from Reykjavik simple, easy, or without ruts and potholes, but certain prospects for breaking through to new horizons in Soviet-U.S. relations do undoubtedly exist. It is toward this, of course, that Soviet foreign policy, which is being conducted honestly, openly, and consistently, is directed.

'POINTLESS' DISPUTES WAGED OVER WHO 'WON,' NAME

PM060959 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] These days the word "Reykjavik" is on everyone's lips. The kind of worldwide plebiscite which has developed around the upcoming meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President makes it possible to identify a watershed in the attitude of opposing political forces to the most burning problem of modern times.

There is every reason to say that the accord on the Reykjavik meeting has received the support of the vast majority of the planet's population. The peoples understand that the time for rhetoric is past. An opportunity is objectively taking shape now to make progress in talks between the USSR and the United States on the key component of security -- nuclear and space arms. The peoples expect a substantial step to be taken in Reykjavik on the way to this.

But this prospect also has opponents in the United States. And there are many of them. The supporters of confrontation are in a frenzy. Continuing to look at all that is happening exclusively through the prism of confrontation, they are striving to impose a pointless argument on the country: Who has "won" -- Moscow or Washington -- and will not any agreement that might be reached be "fashioned only in the Soviet Union's favor"? A. Hammer, the well-known American businessman, made an expressive reply to those politicians of yesterday in an appearance on a CBS program: "Both sides have won. The overall result can be good for the cause of peace."

Another scholastic dispute also serves as a means of diverting public attention from the chief issue: What are we to call what will take place in the Icelandic capital -- a top-level meeting or something else? With a deeply serious mien people are arguing over whether it will be a "mini top-level meeting," a "governmental meeting," or a "preliminary mini summit." But, it seems to me, does the name really matter?

The chief thing is not to miss the historic chance that Reykjavik opens up before us. As for the Soviet side, it will work toward precisely this at the upcoming working meeting.

U.S. SPOKESMAN'S CLAIM OF HUMAN RIGHTS FOCUS HIT

LD051139 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 5 Oct 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksey Sokolov]

[Excerpts] Good morning, comrades! The main theme of news agencies without doubt continues to be the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. [passage omitted]

And what about in the United States? Certain utterances being made around Washington these days cannot help but catch one's ears. Thus, for example, during a regular briefing, a U.S. Department of State representative, Redman, responding to a question on the summit meeting's agenda, said: All issues will be on the agenda. As for us, he added, the issue of human rights will come first. Does this not hide attempts by certain circles in the United States to immediately foist a discussion of their favorite themes, like human rights in the USSR and others; and, at the same time, to decline to make specific deicisons on curbing the nuclear arms race?

DROBKOV VIEWS REYKJAVIK IMPORT, WEEK'S EVENTS

PM061219 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "International Review"]

[Text] If you arrange the past week's events according to their possible significance for the whole international situation and with the reaction in various countries of the world, then without doubt the announcement of the upcoming working meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan should be placed first. This news instantly and firmly became the main political theme and evoked the broadest response. An international discussion on the main problem of the present day, mankind's survival and progress in the nuclear missile age, is now planned for Reykjavik.

The overwhelming majority of responses demonstrate the peoples' desire for an improvement of the international climate and hope for progress in reducing armaments.

At the same time, notes of alarm sound in the many commentaries. That is quite reasonable. For too long now the world has seen the United States' stubborn refusal to respond with deeds to the far-reaching Soviet initiatives and support the USSR's concrete actions capable of halting and reversing the arms race, primarily the race in nuclear arms. People everywhere have thus become accustomed to Washington's resounding "No!" to all Moscow's proposals, which has now become a "Yes!" to the working meeting in Reykjavik -- good news in itself.

Which Way Is the Wind Blowing? [subhead]

But as we all know, it is not only the path to success which is paved with good intentions. [paragraph continues]

Especially if such intentions are not backed up by concrete and substantial good deeds. In this context the crucial factor in the evaulation of the possible prospects of the upcoming meeting -- and much is now being said and written to this effect in various capitals of the world -- is the sincerity of the two sides' intentions and their readiness to take that test of historical maturity which has befallen the political leaders of our anxious and grim time, when the fate of whole peoples can be decided in the few minutes' flight of nuclear missiles, by a computer program error, or by the hasty decision of those who control those computers, be it president, general, or ordinary private.

As for the Soviet leadership and all our people, the position here is absolutely clear. It was M.S. Gorbachev who put forward a concrete program for the gradual and complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of this century. Relying on and developing this program, the Soviet Union put forward a whole series of initiatives aimed at the adoption in the near future of decisions on the main aspects of the security problem affecting space, strategic offensive, medium-range nuclear, operational-tactical nuclear, chemical, and conventional armaments. The Soviet side has devised a broad range of measures to step up monitoring [kontrol] and strengthen confidence measures. All this was restated to the U.S. President in the Soviet leader's 19 June message. This message proposed that attention be focused on a number of concrete spheres in which progress can be achieved if both sides desire it.

There is no doubt about the USSR's sincere desire to consolidate by deeds the whole package of its peace-loving proposals and to demonstrate the political will and readiness to make difficult decisions for the sake of curbing the military race. The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, which has been in force for over a year, is weighty proof of that. After all, whatever the opponents of ending nuclear explosions may say, the moratorium at present is the touchstone which tests the true and not merely declared desire to curb the nuclear arms race. It is no coincidence that even in the U.S. Congress the demand to at least restrict the yield of underground tests was included by the House of Representatives in an amendment to the draft budget. This aroused the Pentagon's fury. This week in Washington there has been an intensive struggle with congressmen on this question. The whole battery of guns has been firing on Capitol Hill -- ranging from the regular threats to impose the Presidential veto on the House of Representatives' resolution to accusations that the legislators are virtually flouting national security interests.

Incidentally, this continuing skirmish between the Administration and the Congress is a highly eloquent illustration of Washington's course. After all, in addition to the 1-year ban on nuclear explosions with a yield of more than 1 kiloton, the majority in the House also advocated the administration's observance of the SALT II Treaty and the abandonment of tests by antisatellite weapons systems against real targets in space and the buildup of chemical arms production. Shortly before that the Congress made some cuts in the appropriations requested for the "star wars" program. You cannot help asking: If the administration is waging a fierce struggle against its own U.S. Congress on the matter of its military policy, can you easily expect serious steps from it in curbing the arms race?

Like a runaway locomotive with faulty brakes, Washington is completely incapable of reducing even slightly the speed of its overloaded war train. Another nuclear device was detonated in Nevada on Tuesday. The test codenamed "Labquark" with a yield of between 20 and 150 kilotons was postponed for a few hours because of the "strong wind" blowing there, as the test range leaders announced.

I do not know about the wind in Nevada, but the winds of favorable change are clearly not filling the sails of the supporters of nuclear tests. This is demonstrated, in particular, by the growing desire of ordinary Americans to use the opportunity of a new meeting to achieve results that can lead to an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations and to reducing arms.

The United States is now approaching congressional elections when one-third of the Senate and the entire composition of the House will be up for reelection. Both in the House and the Senate, Republicans are afraid that the administration's uncompromising stance toward the USSR and ostentatious rejection of constructive steps to improve the international situation may undermine their electoral chances.

Hence the unprecedented opposition on Capitol Hill to the Pentagon's most bellicose programs, as the U.S. press points out. Hence also the legislators' definite pressure on the administration. According to the PEOPLE'S DAILY WORLD, "the unusually powerful public pressure and the forthcoming congressional elections are forcing Reagan to make a positive response to the Soviet initiatives and proposals."

From Positions of Realism [subhead]

Of course, one can argue about the undoubtedly complex reasons which brought about agreement to accept the proposal on an urgent meeting in Reykjavik from a U.S. Administration which, until recently, reacted negatively to many Soviet initiatives.

This meeting has become possible thanks to the Soviet initiative. In the opinion of the most diverse mass media and politicians in many countries, this is yet further proof of our country's deep interest in easing international tension and overcoming the obstacles great and small on the path toward a durable and secure peace. At the same time, the accord on holding a meeting in Reykjavik was a joint one. This means it was achieved thanks to realism and constructive approach shown by both sides. That gives us grounds for hoping that a change for the better may be achieved in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the world as a whole.

Many observers, commenting on the upcoming meeting, see preconditions for realistic attainment of this goal in the successful completion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, in the elaboration and signing in Vienna of conventions on the stable and safe development of the nuclear power industry, and in constructive dialogues being held at a number of other international forums.

One need only recall the recent second international conference which analyzed the impact of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Distruction. Despite the attempts by certain forces to exploit its rostrum to whip up confrontational polemics, this conference, held in Geneva, ended in the adoption of a useful resolution. In it the forum participants reflected the world commu y's mounting interest in banning barbaric bacteriological weapons.

A great deal was said this week at the continuing 41st UN General Assembly session in New York about the need to stop the dangerous buildup of nuclear arsenals, to end the squandering of enormous funds and material resources on preparations for war, and to channel these resources into development needs, environmental protection, and saving mankind from hunger. [paragraph continues]

The representatives of dozens of states who spoke from the rostrum of this organization called for resolute and bold action for the sake of easing tension and limiting arms. There is an increasing trend at the world community's forum to devalue declarations of empty words, while the value of specific practical measures, such as the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, is growing. UN attention is also focusing on the proposal put forward by the socialist countries for a comprehensive system of peace and international security.

The news of the forthcoming Reykjavik summit was broadly approved at the United Nations, as it was worldwide. Representatives of many countries noted that its success and the possible surmounting of the obstacles to restraining the nuclear race could be the major event of this year, declared a Year of Peace by the United Nations.

The largely favorable response to the Reykjavik meeting (if one overlooks the grumbling of extreme right-wing politicians in the United States and the publications that reflect their views) is noteworthy. People everywhere are tired of the stoking of tension, the war mentality, and bad news. There is a real and tangible desire on our planet for a resolute turn for the better and for more trusting and civilized mutual relations between countries and peoples.

Giving a Chance [subhead]

Why did the news of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting rock the world and leave nobody indifferent? For it would seem that alongside their good hopes not only the socialist and developing countries but even many U.S. allies have had quite a disappointing experience of dealing with Washington. Today there is no point deluding ourselves -- the work in Reykjavik and the road to the achievement of mutually acceptable accords and real arms reduction cannot, and probably will not, be easy.

But however high the mountains of weapons accumulated on the planet, mankind has no other choice but to clear them away or, even better, to dismantle and destroy them.

"Communists are convinced that a nuclear apocalypse is not a fatal inevitability. Mankind is capable of averting the terrible threat hanging over it," M.S. Gorbachev said on Friday in his speech in Moscow at the unveiling of the Ernst Thaelmann monument. "Cooperation and mutual understanding on questions of war and peace are the call of the nuclear-space age. As for the Soviet Union, we will continue to strive honestly and vigorously for this and seek political ways of averting the military danger. These considerations dictated our proposal to President R. Reagan to hold a working meeting, so to speak. We have one aim: to finally start implementing the accords we reached with the U.S. President in Geneva. I think this fully accords with the interests of both the Soviet and U.S. peoples and of all peoples."

Soviet people -- and this is particularly borne out by the letters and telegrams currently arriving at PRAVDA -- warmly welcome this broad, businesslike, and bold approach by our country to mutual relations with the United States, despite the negative factors that have emerged recently. In the current difficult situation, when the issues of nuclear and space arms are deadlocked, we must make superhuman [sverkhsilnyye] efforts and embark on the straightest and shortest path to results. For it is obvious that nuclear weapons not only threaten mankind but are already killing people. Their victims are not only the hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In a list of the many millions killed one would find African children who died of starvation, Asian peasants who died of disease, and Latin Americans and the European and North American poor crushed by their perpetual needs.

No such list exists, but if one were compiled it would be a severe indictment of the military-industrial complex embezzling mankind's far from limitless resources. The authors of the report "World Military and Social Spending" published in the United States calculated that more than 800 billion dollars is spent annually on military purposes. That means that the entire annual budget of the WHO could be spent in just 3 hours of the arms race. At the same time up to 600 million people are starving and another 800 million are chronically malnourished. Since 1979 alone famine and malnutrition have accounted for more human lives than all the wars in the last 150 years. The annual appropriations to the U.S. Air Force alone exceed the total funds allocated for educating the 1.2 billion children and teenagers in the African, Latin American, and Asian countries, including Japan. The cost of just one B-1B bomber (and on Thursday 15 such planes, each of which can carry 24 nuclear bombs, entered service on the United States) would easily be enough to save the lives of the hundreds of thousands of children dying in the poorest countries for lack of vaccines or medicine...

Need one recall that in such a situation there is no taks more important than to reverse the growth in military preparations. The Soviet Union is prepared to solve this task and has proved this with practical steps. The ball is now in the U.S. court. The peoples realize that a positive result to the forthcoming Reykjavik meeting, which people are so strongly expecting and hoping for, could be a catalyst and accelerator in the cause of restraining the nuclear race.

DELHI SIX URGE JOINT NUCLEAR ACCORD WITH U.S.

LD040521 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Text] Mexico City October 3 TASS -- The leaders of the "New Delhi Six," advocating peace and disarmament, called upon the leaders of the two great powers to take substantial steps at their forthcoming meeting towards a nuclear test ban.

The heads of state and government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden, says the address, the text of which has been released by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, responded with satisfaction to the news of the forthcoming meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

They express the hope that the day is not far off when the leading nuclear powers will reach accord on the mutual termination of nuclear testing. The forthcoming Soviet-American summit, the leaders of the "New Delhi Six" say, offers a remarkable opportunity to reach such an accord.

The leaders of the six countries welcome the Soviet Union's decision to extend its moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1987 and also its readiness to discuss with experts of the "Six" possibilities for accord on verification.

As before, we are convinced that the moratorium on nuclear testing is the first tangible step on the road of curbing the nuclear arms race and establishing a climate of trust.

WHITE HOUSE SPREADING 'MISINIFORMATION' ON LIBYA

LD070918 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 7 Oct 86

["White House Spreads Misinformation on Libya" -- TASS headline]

[Text] New York October 7 TASS -- The people will now think twice before believing what we are saying -- said a White House representative commenting on the political scandal following the disclosure of the Reagan administration-launched anti-Libyan campaign of misinformation.

At a secret meeting a few weeks ago President Reagan approved the plan of subversive actions against Libya which had been drawn up by the National Security Council. That plan provided for CIA's dissemination of false information on Libya and its leader Al-Qadhdhafi. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, the influential newspaper of U.S. business circles, was the first to have swallowed the bait of the misinformation campaign. On August 25 it printed an article on terror campaign designs being allegedly nurtured by Libya, and planned U.S. retaliatory steps.

It now looks obvious that some high-placed officials of the administration misled the newspaper. Any such attempts to mislead the newspaper and its readers are blameworthy -- said a special statement of the newspaper's editorial board.

DANILOFF CONFIRMS ESPIONAGE CHARGES 'VALIDITY'

LD061210 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 6 Oct 86

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] New York October 6 TASS -- Nicholas S. Daniloff, a former correspondent of the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT in Moscow, has in fact confirmed the validity of the Soviet side's espionage charges against him by admitting that in 1985 he did hand over a packet containing intelligence information to CIA representatives in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Here is what THE NEW YORK TIMES writes on this matter today:

"Mr Daniloff provided many new details about the handling of the letter, an incident that has emerged since his return to the United States on Tuesday as central to both the case against him in Moscow and the Soviet-American arrangement to free him and Gennadiy F. Zakharov.

"Administration officials said after Mr. Daniloff's return here that one reason the White House had accepted an arrangement that to some extent equated his case with that of Mr. Zakharov was to avoid a Soviet trial in which the letter: particularly the CIA's handling of it, might become an issue.

"Mr. Daniloff said in an interview at the Washington bureau of THE NEW YORK TIMES that he first met the priest, a young man who identified himself as Father Roman, in December 1984, when he called the Moscow bureau of U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT. Mr. Daniloff was the magazine's correspondent."

"Mr. Daniloff said he had decided to deliver a letter to the American Embassy that he found in his mailbox in January 1985 and that he assumed came from Father Roman.

"Mr. Daniloff said the letter was addressed to the United States Ambassador, Arthur A. Hartman. When the letter was opened at the Embassy, he said, it contained an interior envelope addressed to William J.Casey, the director of Central Intelligence.

"Since returning to Washington, Mr Daniloff said, he has learned that the letter contained information, potentially valuable to the United States, about Soviet rocket technology.

"A month later, he said, he was called to the Embassy by a senior political officer he knew and was taken to a secure room.

"Mr. Daniloff said they were joined by another top Embassy officer who he now believes was the CIA station chief in Moscow."

"Mr. Daniloff said he provided the Embassy officers with the name and phone number of Father Roman.

"Several months later, in April or May 1985, he was called to the Embassy a second time to discuss the letter, he said.

"Mr. Daniloff thought the incident had ended there until his arrest on August 30, when he was informed by a KGB interrogator that there was evidence the Embassy had twice communicated with Father Roman, once by letter, once by phone, both times indirectly mentioning Mr.Daniloff.

"Mr. Daniloff said that at first he assumed the evidence was fabricated but that since returning to Washington he has learned that a CIA officer in Moscow did communicate with Father Roman.

"In one case, he said, a letter was sent to Father Roman saying that his letter to the Embassy had been received with the aid of 'the journalist'.

"Later, the American intelligence officer called Father Roman and introduced himself by saying he was 'a friend of Nikolay', Mr. Daniloff said.

"Administration officials confirmed last week that these steps, which they called 'unprofessional', had been taken by the CIA station in Moscow."

U.S. TO RESUME CRUISE MISSILE TESTS IN CANADA

PM061051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "More Tests"]

[Text] Ottawa, 4 Oct -- U.S. cruise missile tests will resume in Canada, the National Defense Ministry announced on Friday. They were halted after two flights by these nuclear-capable missiles ended unsuccessfully in January and February this year. Under the military agreement concluded between Canada and the United States in 1983, the Pentagon is empowered to hold six tests of these nuclear missiles a year. The Canadian Foreign Ministry has let it be known that the first of the new series of tests will be held in the fall.

BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS WITH PRC BEGIN

OW070410 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 6 Oct 86

[Text] The ninth round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations began in Beijing on 6 October. The Soviet delegation was headed by Rogachev, special government envoy and deputy foreign minister. The Chinese delegation was led by Qian Qichen, special Chinese Government envoy and deputy foreign minister.

Talking to reporters after his arrival in the Chinese capital, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed the new plan to make the Asian-Pacific region into a peaceful and cooperative zone. The plan was proposed by Soviet leader Gorbachev in his recent Vladivostok speech. The Soviet Union suggested holding a meeting in Hiroshima on Pacific security. The Soviet leader also proposed holding discussions with China at all levels on supplementary measures to establish a goodneighborly situation.

PRC EDUCATIONAL DELEGATION COMPLETES VISIT

PM021019 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation from the PRC state committee for educational affairs headed by Zhu Kaixuan, vice chairman of the committee, was in our country 12-29 September. The guests had talks at the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and were familiarized with the process of restructuring higher education in the Soviet Union. Questions of the development of contacts between Soviet and PRC higher educational establishments were discussed.

The expansion of ties between the two countries in the education sphere will promote the strengthening of long-standing sino-Soviet friendship, Zhu Kaixuan stated on the results of the visit. In visiting Soviet VUZes we can see how much attention is devoted to questions of improving the educational process and its links with scientific research, and to the comprehensive education of students. In currently reforming education in China, we are utilizing the experience of foreign states, primarily the Soviet Union, the guest stressed.

INDIA'S VENKATESWARAN MEETS WITH VORONTSOV

BK031359 Delhi General Overseas Service in English 1330 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Text] The visiting Indian foreign secretary, Mr Venkateswaran, today held talks with the Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr Yuliy Vorontsov, in Moscow. They are said to have discussed preparations for the coming visit of Mr Gorbachev to India. Mr Venkateswaran also met the chairman of the State Committee for Economic Relations With Foreign Countries.

Received by Dobrynin

LD052242 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1620 GMT 5 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Announcer-read report]

[Text] Comrade Dobrynin today received Venkateswaran, foreign secretary of the Indian Ministry of External Relations. Issues of the further development of multilateral ties and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India, as well as some international issues were discussed during a conversation, in which Kaul, Indian ambassador to the USSR, took part, and which took place in a friendly, warm atmosphere.

DRA TO ESTABLISH RECONCILIATION COMMISSION

PM301155 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commission To Be Established"]

[Text] Kabul, 28 Sep -- The PDPA Central Committee Politburo and the DRA Revolutionary Council Presidium have adopted a resolution on establishming an All-Afghan National Reconciliation Commission to further the cause of restoring peace and security within the DRA.

WORK BEGINS ON JOINT AFGHANISTAN POWER LINE

PM030831 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[From roundup of report by unnamed PRAVDA and TASS correspondents dated 27 September under the general heading: "From the Flow of Reports"]

[Text] The first pylons of the power transmission line which will carry electricity from the USSR to the city of Qonduz, the center of Qonduz Province have been set up. The line, constructed with the USSR's economic and technical assistance, is not long -- 56 km -- but it will make possible a reliable power supply to an extensive territory in the north of the DRA.

BRIEFS

DRA TV Station Project -- The Soviet Union will help Afghanistan build 20 television relay stations. An agreement to that effect has been signed in Kabul. This will help build a national television network which will be using a Soviet communications satellite. [Text] [Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 29 Sep 86 LD]

IZVESTIYA REPORTS GROMYKO HENG SAMRIN MEETING

PM061341 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "A.A. Gromyko Meets With Heng Samrin"]

[Text] On 3 October there was a meeting in the Kremlin between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party (KPRP) Central Committee and chairman of the PRK State Council, who is on vacation in the Soviet Union.

A.A. Gromyko talked about the work being done in the USSR to accelerate the socioeconomic development of Soviet society and carry out our state's foreign policy strategy in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

Heng Samrin gave an account of the Cambodian working people's efforts to fulfill the tasks for building a new society in ancient Cambodia set by the Fifth KPRP Congress.

Both sides expressed deep satisfaction with the development of interparty and interstate ties and stressed their mutal resolve to continue steadily expanding Soviet-Cambodian cooperation in various spheres.

During the discussion of the present-day international situation attention was focused on questions of the further activation and coordination of the actions of all peace-loving countries and all peoples in the struggle for peace, for the cessation of nuclear tests, and for the total elimination of mass-destruction weapons by the beginning of the next century.

Both sides noted with deep satisfaction that the report on the upcoming meeting between CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan in Reykjavik has made a wide international impact. The peoples believe that the meeting should contribute to an improvement in Soviet-American relations and to progress on the path toward relaxation of tension and peace.

There was an exchange of opinions on potential ways of implementing the constructive initiatives put forward in M..S. Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech, which are geared to strengthening peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin.

"The Soviet Union," A.A. Gromyko said, "has appealed to all the countries of the Asian-Pacific region to cooperate for peace and mutual security. Anyone seeking this goal will find that Soviet people are earnest interlocutors and honest partners.

The Soviet side placed special emphasis on the fact that the USSR is a convinced advocate of a political solution to existing problems in Southeast Asia. It expresses solidarity with the Indochinese states' willingness to arrange a direct dialogue with the PRC and the ASEAN countries.

Heng Samrin expressed a high opinion of the Soviet state's peace-loving foreign policy course and declared Cambodia's full support for all Soviet peace initiatives.

"The Indochinese countries," he stressed, "are sincerely interested in establishing good relations with all states and in normalizing the situation around Cambodia and in Southeast Asia.

Heng Samrin expressed deep appreciation to the Soviet Union for its constant assistance to and support for the Cambodian people in building a new life and in protecting their peaceful labor.

Im Chhun Lim, assistant to the KPRP Central Committee general secretary, and Hor Nam Hong, PRK ambassador to the USSR, were present at the conversation.

Heng Samrin Departs

BK070329 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 6 Oct 86

[Text] Yesterday, 5 October, Comrade Heng Samrin, general secretary of the KPRP Central Committee and chairman of the PRK Council of State, departed from the Soviet Union.

During his stay in the Soviet Union, the Cambodian leader held talks with Comrade Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Comrade Heng Samrin expressed full support for various peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and expressed thanks for constant Soviet assistance to the Cambodian people in building a new life and in defending their peaceful life.

AUSTRALIANS 'INTIMIDATED' BY SOVIET THREAT

LD041936 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 4 Oct 86

[Text] Canberra October 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksey Voronin reports:

Australians are, as before, being frightened by the "Soviet menace". Now U.S. Admiral Paul McCarthy, commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, has started intimidating the Australians with special zeal. Admiral McCarthy is currently on a visit in Sydney among the U.S. naval squadron invited for the celebrations on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the Australian Navy. The admiral said among other things that the USSR allegedly wishes to "dominate" the Pacific, while the Soviet bombers are already now a threat to Australia.

Judging by the reports in the newspaper "AUSTRALIAN" the commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet is most unhappy about the agreement on fisheries concluded by the USSR with Kiribati and is ready to meet halfway other island states in the southern Pacific, which show interest in this cooperation. The admiral sees the possibility of a buildup of Soviet military presence in the striving of the newly liberated states to put an end to unreserved subordination to Washington and pursue an independent economic and foreign policy.

McCarthy is not at all embarrassed by the fact that his "warnings" by no means correspond to fact. He is passing over in silence the fact that Soviet statements repeatedly stressed interest precisely in peaceful cooperation with states in that region, in strengthening peace and security and the only military presence being built up there is U.S. presence.

U.S. POLICY CONTRAST TO SOVIET ASIAN PROPOSALS

LD010945 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1829 GMT 30 Sep 86

[Commentary by political observer Boris Shabayev]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Sep (TASS) -- State Department specialists on Southeast Asia and Pacific Ocean affairs racked their brains at length before venturing to pronounce publicly on the Soviet proposals on the inclusion of the Asian-Pacific Ocean region in the overall process for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security. And they couldn't come up with anything better than effectively heaping upon the Soviet Union the responsibility for "the solution of the problems of Cambodia, Afghanistan, South Korea, and the DPRK."

Indeed, without a just settlement of regional conflicts an improvement in the situation in Southeast Asia is unthinkable. But finding the correct approach to the resolution of these issues is just as unthinkable without a clear and precise idea of their sources and nature. For example -- Cambodia.

The fate of the long-suffering people of Cambodia aroused no emotion in Washington either when the U.S. B-52 strategic bombers carpet-bombed peaceful Cambodian land, or when Pol Pot's bloody regime exterminated millions of their fellow citizens and provoked continual border conflicts with neighbors. But hardly had the criminal clique of butchers been thrown out and the Cambodians who had escaped genocide were breathing freely, than the "Cambodian issue" arose.

In this connection THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that the United States' central task is to demonstrate its resolve in this region. For this it is necessary to continue backing "Cambodian emigres," and to send supplies of modern weaponry, especially to Thailand, on whose territory the Pentagon is planning to site arms and ammunition dumps "in case of war." Firmly protesting against this plan, THAI RATH, the biggest of Thailand's newspapers, stresses that its implementation amounts to an infringement of the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, threatening to draw it into regional conflict.

The other problem is that of the peaceful reunification of Korea. The Pentagon not only has no thought of withdrawing its 40,000-strong military contigent from South Korea so as to give the Korean people a chance to decide their own destiny, but, as Caspar Weinberger, the head of the Pentagon has stated, it is going to step up the firepower of what is in effect an army of occupation.

This is how the U.S. Administration responds to the DPRK's constructive proposals, backed by the Soviet Union, aimed at resolving the "Korean question."

The decison to return six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet forces in Afghanistan to the Soviet Union before the end of this year is tangible manifestation of the wish of the USSR and the DRA to hasten a political settlement of the Afghanistan situation. Have those who organize, finance and implement the armed intervention against Afghanistan appraised this serious step as they should? No, they continue to bank on extending the scale of the undeclared war against Afghanistan, on terror and coercion.

On which policy does the resolution of regional conflicts in Asia and the Pacific region depend, Soviet or U.S. policy? Is it not the United States, as LE MONDE notes, which is striving to reduce the interest of the whole region to the interests of one power, albeit a great power?

CONTINUED COVERAGE OF GDR CEREMONY FESTIVITIES

Honecker Address

DW031131 East Berlin Television Service in German 0717 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Address by Erich Honecker, SED Central Committee General secretary and GDR State Council chairman, at a ceremony in Moscow marking the unveiling of a monument to Ernst Thaelmann -- live -- no video available]

[Text] Dear Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, dear friends and comrades, dear Muscovites: For us German communists, today is a moving day. We are happy to celebrate this day together with you, dear Muscovites. The inauguration of this worthy monument to Ernst Thaelmann is also an expression of the unshakable bonds linking the GDR and the USSR in the struggle for peace and socialism.

It was Ernst Thaelmann, who continuing great revolutionary traditions, very early saw the Soviet Union as the first country in the world to open up an untrodden field for a better future of mankind by abolishing the exploitation of man by man and by building socialisim, a country, which, on the basis of its new social order, would develop into a bulwark of peace and progress. With this monument, the life and work of a great man and revolutionary are honored for whose freedom the masses of the people rallied in every world capital between 1933 and 1939, and whose thought and action even today -- 42 years after his cold-blooded assassination by the brown military -- exert profound influence on our struggle for peace and socialism.

Ernst Thaelmann, the great son of the German nation and ardent internationalist, was very closely connected with Lenin's party and Red October, as we all know. He devoted all his life to the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, ideas which have changed the world. He remained true to that noble cause until his death. In jail, a shining symbol of resistance against the criminal Hitler fascism and the Hitler regime, he wrote that communism is the doctrine of the liberation of the working class. However, it is the doctrine of the liberation of the working class. However, it is the doctrine of the liberation of all people. I am proud of having fought for it all my life.

We are absolutely correct in stating that Ernst Thaelmann's legacy has become reality in the GDR, the first worker-peasant state on German soil. Socialism is definitely firmly rooted here. The seed of liberation, sown by the victory of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition, has borne fruit. In the 37th year of the GDR's existence, our people shape their lives and future with clear success. Friendship with the Soviet Union has become a matter that is dear to our people's hearts. [applause]

Dear Comrades, our 11th Party Congress, at which we were pleased to welcome you, dear Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, outlined further perspectives to shape the socialist society in our country further. Those resolutions -- the continuation of our course of the unity of economic and social policy, linking economic performance with improvement in the material and cultural living standard -- create an atmosphere throughout the country. Much has been achieved. By the end of August alone, the national income rose 4.3 percent, while the original cost in industry decreased 2 percent. More than 90 percent of the increase in national income was achieved through an increase in labor productivity, meaning by using the most modern technologies.

However, we are not satisfied with that. We are starting to tackle new, bigger tasks in the economy, science and technology, as well as in education and culture.

In daily political discussions with the working people, and by including them on a broad basis in the implementation of our policy, our party releases creative forces and at the same time strengthens its close trusting relationship with the people.

It is known that since 1949 the USSR has been the GDR's most important trading partner. Our country also ranks first in the USSR's foreign trade. According to our long-term agreement for the period 1986-90, our mutual goods exchange will amount to more than R82 billion. That is the largest agreement ever concluded between two countries. The long-term program to develop our cooperation in science, technology, and production for the period until 2000 is of special importance. It is indispensable to find the most effective way to implement it. The GDR will continue conscientiously to fulfill the joint accords and make its active contribution toward opening up new opportunities for cooperation.

Dear friends, and comrade, dear Muscovites, with its resolutions on the acceleration of the Soviet Union's socioeconomic development, the 27th CPSU Congress, which I had the honor to attend, initiated a stage of great, revolutionary, creative work. The Soviet Union's material and intellectual potential will grow to an enormous extent. That serves the Soviet people's well-being and is at the same time of great importance for the international position of the Soviet Union, and even socialism in general. We wish the communists and all Soviet working people great success in the further implementation of the policy laid down by the 27th CPSU Congress. [applause]

We are honoring Ernst Thaelmann's legacy primarily by doing everything in our power to safeguard a secure peace. In his time, Ernst Thaelmann passionately warned that those who voted for Hitler were voting for war. The World War started by fascism brought immense suffering to the world. When it was over and fascism was eradicated, we vowed that we would not rest and would continue our efforts for the lasting preservation of peace. We vowed that war would never again be started from German soil. Since the day it was founded, the GDR has stood for that, and it will continue to struggle for it. [applause]

Today, given the danger of the nuclear self-destruction of mankind, peace is more vital than ever. We struggle for it alongside the Soviet Union. Through its untiring constructive initiatives it has rendered the peoples' interests an immeasurable historic service. We fully support the many various proposals submitted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the interest of our common ideal -- a world without war and without weapons.

The complex program jointly announced by the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest on nuclear and conventional disarmament, dialogue, the return to detente, and the development of mutually advantageous cooperation of all countries is for us, too, the basis of our practical action. Beyond all that which separates us, we are ready to cooperate with anyone showing common sense and realism and pursuing equal goals.

Our people assess the forthcoming meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan in Iceland's capital as an event of extreme importance for further international development. We welcome the meeting, which came about at Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal, and hope that constructive accords will be reached allowing steps in the direction of disarmament and detente. The example set by the Soviet Union by the repeated extension of its moratorium on nuclear tests has encouraged peace forces in the world. They demand all the more emphatically that the United States also renounce further nuclear tests.

No new mass destruction means, and end to the arms race on the earth and its prevention in space, concrete disarmament steps, not confrontation but cooperation -- those are our maxims. Peace, peace, and again peace! [applause]

Dear friends and comrades, dear Muscovites, on this memorable day when we are honoring Ernst Thaelmann, and at this powerful meeting, which reactivates our fraternal ties, I say:

Long live the Great Soviet people!

Long live the CPSU, its Central Committee, and its general secretary, Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev!

Long live our common cause of socialism and communism!

Long live the struggle for peace! [applause]

SEW's Schmitt Speaks

LD041034 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1006 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Report on speech by Horst Schmitt, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin (SEW), at the 3 October ceremony for the unveiling of the memorial to Ernst Thaelmann in Moscow]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (ADN) -- The speech by the chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin has the following text:

The Communists of West Berlin thank the CPSU Central Committee from the bottom of their hearts for the honor being bestowed upon Ernst Thaelmann, that great leader of the German proletariat and exemplary revolutionary who was murdered by the fascists, with the memorial in the Soviet Union.

In his time, Thaelmann called to the German workers, "look at where we communists are at the helm, where we communists are in government. We have shown there what we are able to achieve." The great friend of the Soviet Union rightly and indefatigably propagated the great revolutinary achievements of the Soviet working people, which they accomplished under the leadership of the party of Lenin as the bright future of mankind. We West Berlin Communists are striving today to prove ourselves worthy of this legacy.

Precisely in view of the current tense international situation, this is of historical importance; for, after all, the USSR and the socialist community form the basis of the entire struggle for peace in the world.

In this spirit we regard the signing of the Stockholm Document as a hopeful sign in the struggle for a radical amelioration of the international situation and as a considerable step in the struggle for a change from the arms race to disarmament and from the policy of confrontation to a policy of security and cooperation.

Today, in the nuclear age, the state of arms technology forces mankind on pain of destruction to prevent a world war. If one really wantd to prevent a war, Thaelmann once said, its preparations had to be recognized, unmasked and combatted in time.

This is precisely what we are doing. The alliance against war is also much stronger today. It embraces not only the socialist world, but also the great mass of the nonaligned states and is active right up to governments of NATO countries. It seems particularly important to us that it has embraced not only the communist workers movement, but, more and more, social democrats, christians, trade unions and ecological-social movements as well. A truly world-spanning peace movement, right up to the circles of the bourgeoisie, has arisen. It is understood better and better that peace and security can be achieved only with one another and not against one another. Here is the force capable of putting the confrontation policy of the Reagan Administration in its place.

We West Berlin Communists have at all times combatted the imperialist lie that a threat to other states emanates from the Soviet Union. We would like on this occasion to say thank you to you, dear Comrade Gorbachev, for your numerous and untiring peace and disarmament initiatives.

Our opinion is: The unilateral moratorium commitment that the Soviet Union has imposed on itself for more than a year now in regard to stopping nuclear tests, is not only a convincing proof of the seriousness of the Soviet disarmament proposals, it is also simultaneously an enormous stimulator for the further development of the struggle for peace on earth.

With you, we demand of the U.S. Administration that they should finally find themselves ready for a nuclear test ban agreement and give up all star wars plans.

Today, to fight in the spirit of Ernst Thaelmann means, for us West Berlin communists, primarily to mobilize the masses even more resolutely toward the struggle for peace and against the policy of confrontation and arms buildup of the most aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism.

It means primarily for us to use all our strength to help realize the program of nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 as well as the plan for collective security.

It means that primarily we must guard the close friendship of the West Berlin Communists with the Leninist CPSU and the first socialist state of the world, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as the apple of our eye and to be loyal, unbending fighters for proletarian internationalism against imperialism and war.

Long live world peace and socialism.

DKP's Mies Speaks

LD041016 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1001 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Report on speech by Herbert Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party (DKP), at the 3 October ceremony for the unveiling of the Ernst Thaelmann memorial in Moscow]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Oct (ADN) -- The chairman of the German Communist Party, Herbert Mies, made the following speech at the rally:

At this moment, when we are unveiling the Thaelmann memorial, I am thinking of two events of not too long ago. I recollect the unveiling of the Thaelmann memorial in Thaelmann Park in the GDR capital and I think of the trial of Thaelmann's murderer in Krefeld in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Thaelmann in two worlds -- in the world of socialism, and in the world of capital. Here he is honored, there he is controversial. Here and there he is for us an outstanding fighter, a great labor leader, a true personality. We will do everything possible to see that a memorial is also erected in his home town of Hamburg.

If personalities are measured according to what they set in motion historically, then one can say: Thaelmann's work is linked with the development of the rewvolutionary force of the German working class, with the development of the Communist Party of Germany into a mass party. His work is bound up with the unity of action and the united front against fascism and war. Above all, however, his work is bound up with friendship with the Soviet Union. Friendship with the Soviet Union, peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union -- this is also indispensable today. It is also indispensable that in the Federal Republic's policy the stones are removed that stand in the path not only of friendship with the Soviet Union but also of the safeguarding of a lasting peace in Europe and in the world: the Federal Republic's involvement in SDI must cease. The U.S. nuclear missiles must disappear from the Federal Republic; the chemical weapons must be destroyed. Above all, the Federal Republic must actively support an immediate ban on nuclear weapon tests and the creation of a world without nuclear weapons. This is a dictate of national and European reason.

Moscow has another memorial, and the entire world, the working class in all countries has another symbol, a symbol of solidarity with all fighters who have dedicated themselves to the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. This moment is thus also extended to the fighters of Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

When Ernst Thaelmann was in barbaric Nazi imprisonment the great Danish poet Martin Anderson wrote of him: "Ernst Thaelmann personifies, in a way that hardly anyone has, the coming Germany.... In the struggle between culture and barbarity Ernst Thaelmann has become the most powerful symbol of human strength." Yes, Ernst Thaelmann personified particularly impressively the strength of his class, which is called upon to overcome the society of the exploitation and oppression of man by man ad to create a world of free work, peace and true humanity.

We Communists from the FRG are pleased that these characteristics of Ernst Thaelmann are reflected in the memorial which is being unveiled today. For this we thank the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Gorbachev, all initiators, the sculptors and the builders of this memorial. Our fight for Ernst thaelmann's cause, the cause of peace, freedom and socialism, is out thanks to you all. Our thanks are always linked with respect for the mighty successes of the Soviet peoples, for their current enthusiasm and their inovation in the implementation of the decisions of the historic 27th Party Congress.

Gorbachev, Ligachev, at Dinner

LD031350 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 3 TASS -- A dinner was given here today in honour of Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Herbert Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party, and Horst Schmitt, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin. Irma Gabel-Thaelmann, the daughter of Ernst Thaelmann, was among the guests.

On the Soviet side the dinner was attended by Mikhail Gorbachev, Yegor Ligachev, Boris Yeltsin, Anatoliy Dobrynin, Vadim Medvedev, and other officials.

SHEVARDNADZE HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE IN MEXICO

LD051052 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 5 Oct 86

[Text] Mexico City October 5 TASS -- Upon completion of his visit to Mexico, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, gave a press conference here for Soviet and foreign newsmen, he said:

I have been deeply impressed by the conversation with President Miguel de la Madrid of Mexico. We continued in Mexico City the exchange of views recently started in New York during the U.N. General Assembly session. This is a noteworthy fact to me: two meetings with the head of your state held in the course of a few days.

This, in my view, is evidence that our relations are assuming dynamism, and the Soviet-Mexican dialogue is deepening.

The talks with Mr. Sepulveda, the secretary for foreign affairs of Mexico, have borne out that observation. We have discussed quite a large range of issues and broadened the field of mutual understanding.

The minister's speech at the dinner contained a very interesting analysis of the international situation and our relations.

His idea of the need for a truly innovatory approach to international relations is particularly close to us.

The personal contacts have strengthened, which will, undoubtedly, better interaction between our two ministries [sentence as received]. On behalf of the Soviet Government I extend to my colleague an invitation to visit our country. I can say that Mr. Sepulveda is planning to visit the Soviet Union next spring.

I consider the meetings with Mr. Hernandez Cervantes, the secretary of commerce and industrial development, and Mr. Del Mazo Gonzalez, the secretary of energy, mines and federal industry, to be necessary and important. I will say that I share many of their views. Economy has always influenced politics, this is even more correct today.

Exchanges of views with senators, leading officials of the Senate on questions of bilateral relations and international problems and the conversation with the leaders of the revolutionary institutional party have been an organic part of the visit.

The meetings with intellectuals, people prominent in culture, the arts and science, meetings with the Mexicans in the streets and squares have enriched our impressions immensely. Despite the fact that the visit was brief, it has proved to be valuable, and I would say, highly effective, great credit for which goes to our hospitable hosts.

I can say that over these two days, the connection of the times -- Mexico's past, present and the future opened to me. I could feel that connection at the monument "Alter of the homeland", in the halls of the national museum, standing at the great creations of Siqueiros. I wish to repeat here what I said in the "Poliforum": That temple is the venue of lessons of peace in the language understandable to all peoples -- the language of great art.

Thank you for that.

The nuclear space age has completely reshaped the notions of time and space, cancelled the remoteness factor and faced the entire mankind with the need to make a choice. I wish to stress, the whole mankind.

The troubles and problems of many countries also concern everybody. The consequences of deep economic stagnation can have unpredictable effects for the whole world economic system. And nobody will be able to resolve his problems on his own, if an end is not put to the weapons race, especially the nuclear weapons race, the creation of space weapons is not stopped, and the levels of military confrontation is not lowered.

History-making changes are under way on the South American continent. Military dictatorships are collapsing, the few surviving military juntas look like an anomaly. Democracy is making impressive successes.

I am confident that this process cannot be halted.

Yet with all that one cannot help seeking how some forces wish to use it, so as to impose a policy advantageous to those forces on the elected governments.

In that connection, I would like to explain our stand.

Each country is an independent full-fledged subject of international law and international relations. Hence all other states should honour its right to its own choice. With whom and what relations it may have, what commitments it may undertake and what unions and organizations join.

We are guided by that in our relations with Mexico. She maintains a system of relations with the states of the region, including with the United States, which have historically shaped, as it [as received] has certain commitments under the inter-American and other treaties. We honour that and do not intend to improve our relations at the cost of the interests of other countries contrary to the existing realities.

Our economic, trade and cultural cooperation only complements and enriches the ties and traditions, which have established here.

This, by the way, concerns all the countries of Latin America. I would like to hope that this principle set forth in Mexico on behalf of the Soviet leadership will be perceived everywhere on your continent.

Events have taken place in the world which make it possible to forecast the political weather for tomorrow.

As a result of the successful meeting in Stockholm, certain difficult questions pertaining to the military activity of states, say, the question of inspection and verification, have been solved for the first time so as to promote stronger trust. The documents of the Stockholm conference contain many other things that could be usefully applied beyond the boundaries of the European continent.

Take Central America, for example. Couldn't the Contadora group make use there of something from the European practice?

Formulas, methods and procedures have not only been proposed, but also tried out to a substantial degree in Europe.

Since I started speaking about Central America, let me say: The settlement there would not be much of a problem if the case in point was agreements between the existing governments, not the attempts at toppling the legitimate government of Nicaragua by the political means (in addition to the military ones).

Sharpening the polemics, I will permit myself one comparison.

As you must know well, a no small number of states whose socio-political system differs, I would say fundamentally differs, from our own, are situated around the Soviet Union. Turkey, for one. Quite enough weapons are concentrated on its territory and, mind you, these are aimed directly at the Soviet Union, the United States maintains it presence there as well, and there are tens of bases on which nuclear-capable U.S. air force planes are stationed, too.

Nonetheless, we have good, stable, goodneighborly relations with Turkey and we have never incited opposition forces there to try and topple the existing authority, much less financed them.

Compare this with the U.S. attitude to Nicaragua. Attempts at justifying it by the mythical military presence of the Soviet Union in that country are laughable. I can declare with all responsibility: There is no Soviet military presence in Nicaragua and has never been.

The reasons for the attacks on Nicaragua, just like on Cuba, lie elsewhere -- in the allergy of the administration of the United States to what does not come in line with its understanding of the manners of political conduct.

The new thinking in the nuclear and space age demand from every government the desire and ability to rise above its prejudices and bias.

A tidal wave of rejection of nuclear weapons and nuclear testing has swept the world. I am confident that with time the politicians advocating the preservation of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and space arms, will be compelled to seek other jobs.

But in the meantime new types of weapons are being developed. It is claimed in the United States nowadays that electromagnetic guns, in development for "star wars", may become the most potent weapon of the 21st century and can be used in conventional warfare on the land surface. This means that a "double" of nuclear weapons is being designed.

M.S. Gorbachev has emphasized more than once that the Soviet Union does not want to decide the destinies of mankind alone or with someone else.

But if the other side encroaches on them, we will be compelled to develop such weapons that would guarantee the security of our country. We would like to avoid the second option. It is really unacceptable to either us or to mankind.

In these conditions the Soviet leadership arrived at the conclusion that the situation should be clarified and that primarily our strategic relations with the United States of America should be clarified. M.S. Gorbachev wrote to President Reagan proposing, as you must well know, to hold a meeting on October 11-12 in Iceland and to discuss directly all this, the urgent problems.

The meeting in Iceland is of paramount importance for us all, for any country. And we hope that it will end with a practical result so eagerly awaited by all.

Eduard Shevardnadze then answered questions asked by the newspeople.

The journalists showed a great deal of interest in the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

Eduard Shevardnadze also answered questions related to the results of his official visit to Mexico, his talks and meetings with the leaders of that country, prospects for the further development of Soviet-Mexican relations, the Soviet appraisal of the situation in Central America and certain aspects of the task of establishing a new international economic order.

Confirms Submarine Deaths

PA050327 Paris AFP in Spanish 0251 GMT 5 Oct 86

[Text] Mexico City, 4 Oct (AFP) -- Tonight in Mexico City, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said that there is "no possibility of an explosion or nuclear contamination" following the accident which a Soviet nuclear submarine had off the Bermudas, in the north Atlantic.

During a press conference, the Soviet Minister confirmed that three persons had died in the accident and that "some had been injured." Shevardnadze noted that steps were taken to extinguish the fire and that international organizations had been alerted.

PRAVDA SHEVARDNADZE MEXICO TRIP COMMUNIQUE

PM071001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Mexican Joint Communique"]

[Text] Mexico City, 5 Oct -- E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, was on an official visit to Mexico 2-5 October 1986 at the invitation of the Mexican Government conveyed by secretary of Foreign relations Bernardo Sepulveda.

The Soviet guest laid a wreath at the "Altar to the Motherland" monument in Mexico City.

During his stay in Mexico, E.A. Shevardnadze was received by President of the Republic Miguel de la Madrid. [paragraph continues]

In the course of the meeting he conveyed to the president of Mexico a message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In his message, the Soviet leader expressed desire for the continued strengthening of relations between the two countries, outlined the Soviet Union's assessment of the contemporary international situation, and declared his determination to continue the struggle for peace and disarmament. The president of Mexico expressed thanks for the message and expressed gratification as regards its contents.

Reciprocal interest in an exchange of official visits by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President of Mexico M. de la Madrid was expressed during the conversation, which proceeded in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

E.A. Shevardnadze had a meeting with A. Riva Palacio, chairman of the Grand Commission of the Senate of Mexico's National Congress.

E.A. Shevardnadze had talks with Secretary of Foreign Relations B. Sepulveda and also had conversations with H. Hernandez Cervantes, secretary of commerce and industrial development, and A. del Maso Gonzalez, secretary of energy, mines, and parastate industry.

The talks between the foreign ministers proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. Both sides apprised highly the traditionally cordial and friendly nature of relations between the peoples and governments of the USSR and Mexico and emphasized the need for their development and for the expansion and diversification of bilateral cooperation on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence between states, their juridical equality, mutual respect, and self-determination, and noninterference in internal affairs.

The sides noted with gratification that relations between the USSR and Mexico are acquiring an increasingly active and multifaceted nature. They took note of a deepening of political and interparliamentary ties and expressed the firm desire for their further development.

Favorable opportunities for the expansion of economic ties and trade were noted, taking into account the industrial and trade potential of the USSR and Mexico. The importance of the fourth session of the Mixed Commission for Economic and Trade Cooperation, to be held in Moscow 12-15 October this year, was stressed. Hope was expressed that this session will provide a good opportunity to galvanize economic and trade relations and also to elaborate and create new machinery to assist the expansion of trade exchanges and cooperation in sectors already earmarked, like hydorelectric power industry, copper smelting production, ferrous metallurgy, the textile industry, tractor assembly, the agro-industrial sector, tourism, fisheries, the chartering of Soviet oil tankers, and housing construction.

Both sides noted the importance of interbank cooperation, which stimulates and supports the entire complex of trade and economic ties between the two countries. They expressed mutual satisfaction with the renewal [vozobnovleniye] of the long-term agreement between "Traktoroeksport" and the Mexican "Sidena" enterprises covering deliveries of tractor components and parts to Mexico.

The ministers emphasized their particular satisfaction with the fact that the rich culture and historical heritage of both countries have helped the attainment of a high level of development of bilateral relations in the relevant spheres, particularly in education, social sciences, the graphic arts, literature, music, cinematography, radio and television, the exchange of publications and books, and artistic exchanges.

The sides agreed to step up efforts to fulfill the cooperation programs in science and technology. The fourth session of the Mixed Commission for Scientific and Technical Cooperation, due to be held shortly in Moscow, will offer a convenient opportunity to elaborate mutually advantageous, priority projects in this sphere.

The USSR and Mexican foreign ministers emphasized that the defense of peace is the most urgent problem of our time and that the preservation of human civilization is a cause of all people. With regard to the threatening development of arsenals of means of destruction and increasingly sophisticated military equipment, which places all mankind in jeopardy, they emphasized that international security must be achieved by politcal means, by way of the reduction and complete liquidation of mass annihilation weapons and other disarmament measures. Absolute priority among such measures must be given to the destruction of nuclear weapons. Not a single country, not a single government can avoid the responsibility for accomplishing this task, particularly those which have nuclear weapons.

Both sides agreed on the urgent need to curb and terminate the arms race on earth and prevent its transfer to outer space, which belongs to all mankind and must be utilized exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The ministers declared that, in parallel with the rigorous adherence to agreements limiting the nuclear arms race, it is an immediate task to reach new agreements on reductions of all types of nuclear weapons and means for their delivery and on banning the testing, production, and deployment of space weapons. Peace and coexistence among states can be based only on observance of the principles and norms of international law, which they have accepted.

Having noted that close line between disarmament and development, both sides spoke in favor of the need to switch resources currently expended on armaments to the needs of socioeconomic development.

The ministers discussed the contents of the "Mexico Declaration" adopted by the leaders of the six countries and emphasized that the initiative in favor of peace and disarmament contained in this declaration is an important step in the cause of achieving disarmament and ensuring peace and international security and contributes to detente and the process of political dialogue among the states of the international community.

E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed the Soviet Union's support for the basic goals of the "Mexico Declaration," expressed earlier in M.S. Gorbachev's message in reply to the six countries' leaders.

B. Sepulveda emphasized that Mexico highly values the support given by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the "Mexico Declaration" and believes that this support is a great incentive to continued activity by the "Six" for the sake of peace and disarmament.

In the course of the talks the ministers emphasized in particular the importance of the halting of nuclear tests for the conclusion of a treaty on the complete prohibition of such tests as a necessary step toward nuclear disarmament. They also noted that termination of nuclear tests is fully attainable on the basis of an absolutely reliable verification [kontrol] system. In this regard, B. Sepulveda positively assessed the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which it has unilaterally observed for more than a year now.

Both ministers are convinced that the creation of nuclear-free zones is an important step in favor of peace and the curbing of the arms race. E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the Soviet Union supports the treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America and advocated the strengthening of that treaty and of the region's nuclear-free status. The sides also expressed support for various initiatives aimed at the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

E.A. Shevardnadze explained the essence of the foreign policy initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union this year, particularly the proposal on the creation of an all-embracing system of international security and the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction by the end of the century, which includes a ban on space weapons.

In this regard B. Sepulveda declared that the Mexican Government positively assesses these initiatives and considers them a significant contribution to the international climate, and the strenthening of confidence among states.

The USSR and Mexican foreign ministers emphasized the united Nation's role in the system of interstate relations and the great importance of its activity in the interest of peaceful solution of international conflicts and the struggle for disarmament and for the creation of an atmosphere of peace and security.

Expressing concern with regard to attempts that have been made to diminish the international organization's importance, the ministers confirmed their countries' commitment to the principles and goals of the UN Charter and pledged to make maximum efforts to enhance the efficiency fo that organization.

E.A. Shevardnadze declared that the Soviet Government attaches particular importance to the maintenance of peace in Europe, has for this purpose put forward various initiatives aimed at the limitation and reduction of arms and armed forces in the region, and is also encouraging dialogue among European countries as a means for creating a climate of detente which will help reduce the threat of war. The sides emphasized the importance of the all-European process which began in Helsinki and positively assessed the results of the Stockholm conference, which reflect the beginnings of a new approach to problems of security, confidence, and disarmament in Europe.

As regards relations between the USSR and the United States, E.A. Shevardnadze noted the Soviet government's desire for their improvement. In this context he emphasized the importance of the Reykjavik meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan as an important step in the process of elaborating [vyrabotka] specific agreements on fundamental problems which could mark the beginning of a new stage in relations between the two countries and could help create an atmosphere of peace and confidence among states.

For his part, B. Sepulveda declared that the Mexican Government attaches great inportance to the renewal fo this dialogue and the process of detente.

Both sides emphasized the urgent need for the political settlement of conflicts and disputes among states in various parts of the world in accordance with the universally recognized norms of international law.

B. Sepulveda briefed E.A. Shevardnadze in detail about the activity of the Contadora Group and its support group, aimed at ensuring a fitting and lasting peace in Central America on the basis of the principles of noninterference and self-determination for the peoples.

He emphasized that the solution of the Central American crisis depends mainly on the region's states themselves, and that this conflict must under no circumstances be looked at from the narrow viewpoint of East-West confrontation, because that exacerbates tension and obstructs any efforts aimed at political settlement of this conflict.

The Soviet side expressed concern over the whipping up of tension in Central America and highly assessed the Mexican Government's efforts within the framework of the process of peaceful settlement implemented by the Contadora Group and its support group. Consistent support for the constructive efforts of Latin American countries was also reaffirmed.

Both sides expressed profound concern with the situation prevailing in South Africa. The solution of this problem requires an end to the shameful apartheid regime and its policy of discrimination and racial segregation, which is a crime against humanity. They demanded the termination of repressions agains the African majority and acts of aggression against neighboring countries and the application of sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the UN Charter. The ministers spoke out for immediate granting of independence to Namibia on the basis of the appropriate UN resolutions.

The sides favored the establishement of a new international economic order guaranteeing equal economic security for all states and also the resumption of global talks within the UN frameork on the most important international ecoonomic problems, including the problem of foreign debt.

Agreement was reached that the two countries' foreign ministries will hold regular consultations on questions of bilateral relations and international problems of mutual interest. These consultations will be help periodically in Moscow and in Mexico City. The sides will continue the practice of consultations in internation organizations and at international forums.

Both sides expressed gratification with the results of the USSR foreign minister's visit to Mexico and expressed confidence that the visit will help the further development of the traditionally friendly ties between the two countries.

E.A. Shevardnadze expressed thanks for the cordial reception accorded to him in Mexico. On behalf of the Soviet Government, he renewed the invitation to Secretary of Foreign Relations B. Sepulveda to pay an official visit to the USSR, and it was accepted with thanks. The time of the visit will be agreed through diplomatic channels.

SHEVARDNADZE DEPARTS MEXICO 5 OCTOBER

LD051635 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 5 Oct 86

[Text] Mexico City October 5 TASS -- Upon completing his official visit to Mexico, Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., departed from Mexico City today.

At the airport he was seen off by the minister of foreign affairs of Mexico, Bernardo Sepulveda, and other officials.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL VIEWS RESTRUCTURING PROCESS

PM061435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "To Be the Master and Not a Guest in Your Own Home"]

[Text] This home is our own Land of the Soviets, the first worker-peasant state in the world. Great changes are taking place in it today. The party has urged everyone to restructure and to actively participate in the struggle for a new qualitative condition of society. This is a very serious matter -- restructuring the home in which we live and will continue to live. It is being done for the sake of the people, for the sake of present and future generations.

The restructuring process is gathering force, its momentum is irreversible. The people have met the party's appeal with open hearts. At the same time, as is noted in the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Results of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's Trip to Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays," the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the June Central Committee plenum and the course aimed at renewal are being followed with the proper dynamism and the restructuring process is making complex, contradictory, and uneven progress, coming up against various social, psychological, and organizational barriers, and encountering resistance from those who, for their own selfish interests, are trying to hold onto outmoded procedures and privileges. The restructuring process is being retarded by bureauratic distortions in the work of the administrative apparatus, by lack of discipline, and by irresponsibility.

The whole of society and each one of us as individuals must restructure. This means that we must take an exacting look again and again at our position, our views, our approaches and evaluations. An honest, principled look. It means everyone must be master rather than a guest in his own fatherland, his own home. It is a question of broadening democracy in every sphere of our life. It is a question of being able to work in the conditions of greater democracy -- which has not yet been managed by everyone -- and of trying to learn to work in a new way. To learn to listen to and hear people's opinions, rather than give orders and commands. Learn to respond to trust with trust and rely on the collective advice of Communists and non-party people, workers and specialists. The prerequisites must be created in labor collectives and party organizations whereby a person feels himself to be master of his country.

Being master is not easy. The master is responsible for everything that happens in his home. Yes, each one of us has great rights -- they are guaranteed by the USSR Constitution. But we also have great responsibilities. This should not be forgotten. The chief of these is that we must work honestly, so that there is no stagnation in this home, so that things change for the better, and so that everyone acts with energy and is not reconciled to shortcomings. Precisely this kind of situation is being created in progressive collectives, for which a considerable amount of concern is shown by party and social organizations, encouraging the initiative and creativity of those who really deserve this.

Today we speak of the fresh wind of change with satisfaction. Openness in our society is growing, troubling problems are openly discussed, different viewpoints contend with one another, and criticism and self-criticism are developing. Letters sometimes even ask whether there is not too much criticism? But there are also flaws of another kind. [paragraph continues]

The newspaper only had to appear carrying an editorial entitled "Democracy and Discipline" for some readers -- having reacted well to the first part of the title -- to voice a reproach concerning the second part: The newspaper was once again calling for the suppression of criticism, they said, and primarily "from below."

The level of criticism -- this is the opinion of the party and the people -- should not be lowered. It has a benefical effect on social processes and it is hard to overestimate its role. But democracy is not only the right to criticize, it also concerns duty. It is a question of discipline. Democracy is not total license. It is clearly exercised as the unity of rights and responsibilities which allow a person to demonstrate his civic position. Democracy presupposes the working participation of everyone in the realization of society's goals. It is, therefore, not a question of suppressing criticism "from below" but the point is that, in the face of the new tasks in our common home, everyone is equal and everyone has the same rights and the same responsibility for the fate of our plans.

Democracy presupposes first of all that the working class -- trained and educated -- and the kolkhoz peasantry -- with a great deal of experience and faith in the collective running of farms -- and our intelligentsia -- which has accumulated great intellectual potential -- should all use what they have, in practice: their experience, their education, and their potential, for the sake of the common cause. We have everything for renewing our country, we have the base created by the heroic labor of previous and present generations, and this makes it possible to move confidently forward.

The restructuring process is taking place in a struggle between the old and the new. Some are adapting to it. But some, under the guise of increasing democracy, spread absurd rumors, gossip, and blacken the name of honest people by making use of anonymous letters. Commissions spend a considerable amount of time and effort on checking them out, while the person who wrote the anonymous letter is laughing up his sleeve: the issue is confused. Needless to say, this is disgraceful and there is no place for it in our home. Anonymous letter writers and gossipers must be exposed. "The strictest measures must be applied to them," readers demand. "Otherwise, we say that the facts have not been corroborated, it is a lie, we apologize to the honest person, but of the anonymous letter writer -- not a word. So this is what happens: On the one hand, we curse him, but on the other, we use his information."

At the same time, we cannot overlook the conditions in which the unsigned letter was born. It is sometimes the case that people are simply frightened because in their organization legitimate criticism is not taken kindly to and people are victimized for it. In this respect we must all be as attentive as possible.

The lively process of restructuring presupposes a rejection of excessive paperwork, bureaucratic ways, arrogance, and indifference. We must go to the people. Not with the polite question "How are you?" but with the desire to enrich oneself with the masses' opinions and give practical assistance. Unfortunately, in some places "going to the people" is passed off as the main sign of resturcturing and broadening democracy, although sometimes these visits leave no practical trace. There still persist demagogues supposedly fighting for order in their own home. "Yes, there are such people," readers observe, "and especially among these workers who hide their incompetence behind loud words. This is yet another danger on the path of radical change."

The party appeals to the people: Take more active part in the restructuring process. Yes, we have a considerable number of difficulties: In the economy, in the social sphere, something is not to the liking of some of us, something does not suit someone. General concern, common effort, and a principled, honest approach to everything happening around us -- in this lies the guarantee of success for the restructuring process which must be carried out from above and from below. The people have accepted this process wholeheartedly, and that is why party organizations and Communists are expected to concern themselves with creating a good atmosphere in every collective and set an example of active participation in renewal. Feeling oneself to be master in one's own home is both a civic position and a deep responsibility for the common cause.

ECONOMIST AMBARTSUMOV ON OBSTACLES TO REFORM

PM070924 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 5-6 Oct 86 p 12

[Interview with Yevgeniy A. Ambartsumov, official of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System, by Andrea Tarquini in Florence; date not given]

[Text] Florence -- "I am not opposed to drawing analogies but, as Heraclitus said, water flows by and you cannot step twice into the same river." This was the subtle and dry answer we received from Yevgeniy Arshakovich Ambartsumov when we asked him to compare the era introduced by the 20th CPSU Congress 30 years ago with the Gorbachev reforms. He went on, however: "Let us start with the international situation: Khrushchev had more opportunities -- American interlocutors were less constrained by the pressure of the military-industrial complex, the groups against which even that enlightened conservative Eisenhower warned. Now it is much more difficult to talk with Reagan. Insults such as the definition "evil empire" cannot be forgotten, although probably Gorbachev will encounter a civil interlocutor in Reykjavik, as he did in Geneva. So, we shall see. Meanwhile we consider it a good thing that the Soviet initiative of an urgent meeting was accepted by the United States."

A professor at the Academy of Sciences' Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System, Yevgeniy Arshakovich Ambartsumov is the first Soviet researcher to have come to talk about the awkward anniversary of 1956 at a meeting with Western colleagues and prominent emigres. The parallel between Khrushchev and Gorbachev is unavoidable. So let us hear what he had to say, as an inside observer, because it is not every day that we have the opportunity to do so.

[Tarquini] Yes, professor, the international context is difficult, but what about that home?

[Ambartsumov] Gorbachev is finding it more difficult to carry out his reforms because, especially in the seventies, instances of inertia and distortions accumulated in our society -- not only faults on the part of individual leaders but bad habits rooted in several strata of society, not just within the leadership groups. And in 1956 it was not yet a vital necessity to move onto another, intensive, stage of development. At that time, though changing, society retained the same development mechanisms, whereas we now know that we cannot continue living as we did until yesterday -- and this is most important. In other words, reform has now become urgent, which is why he is talking about "uskoreniye," the need to change as quickly as possible. "There is no other way," Gorbachev has said repeatedly, whereas in 1956 history granted us a certain amount of time. [paragraph continues]

First of all, the economy no longer has the reserves it did many years ago and furthermore there is the accumulated resistance of the groups that manage the economy. He and his team are convinced of the need to surmount these obstacles.

[Tarquini] Do you mean that it was easier to denounce crimes than it is to correct the present distortion?

[Ambartsumov] No, that is not what I mean, because Khrushchev managed to find the political courage to denounce the crimes committed under Stalin. This is not what is at stake now; there are no instances of repression to denounce.

[Tarquini] But is there a more insidious enemy?

[Ambartsumov] Yes, a more difficult enemy to fight. But Gorbachev and his team are of the new generation, better educated people with broader outlooks, and their policy is less contradictory than Khrushchev's. Gorbachev sets no obstacles in the way of criticism, and in fact encourages and stimulates it. For instance, at Khrushchev's time, one day PRAVDA would praise the new artistic trends and the next day it would condemn them, denouncing even the French impressionists....

[Tarquini] So who are the enemies of change, the forces of resistance?

[Ambartsumov] Well, you have used the correct words, and in any case it is enough to read Gorbachev's speeches. Without being a prophet, I can predict that greater and more spectacular conflicts than those of the present may emerge in this struggle for reform and, I would say, for the regeneration of society. As Gorbachev has said, we can identify these groups and see where they lurk. In the capital, where I live, the new party leadership headed by Yeltsin has discovered and reported some very bad things -- on the one hand economic crimes involving leading administrators but on the other hand also delays and falling standards in services in the capital, which was once taken as a model. He has advised party activists to discuss these problems openly. This gives rise to hope.

[Tarquini] Could you further explain the nature of these hopes?

[Ambartsumov] The first is the hope of extricating the country from stagnation, realizing that there is a price to pay, that there is always a price to pay. The second is that of greater attention to social problems, the problems of living standards -- the hope that the present leadership will be willing to sacrifice major industrial programs to give priority to people's problems. The third hope -- third but not least, in fact perhaps the most important of all -- is the hope of social justice.

[Tarquini] How can that be? Is social justice no more than a hope in the homeland of socialism?

[Ambartsumov] In recent years there have been spectacular and scandalous affairs, erosions of the principle of social justice that cried out for redress. These things were apparent to everyone and people's awareness made the situation untenable. Gorbachev is doing a great deal to restore social justice.

[Tarquini] Yes, social justice. In 1956 this was an issue that was not even considered, or at least that was not raised....

[Ambartsumov] Yes, because at that time the detachment was not so apparent. Not even under Stalin did leaders permit themselves the luxuries and privileges that some did under Brezhnev -- starting with members of his own family. Since society has grown meanwhile, so, too, have people's awareness and education and their intolerance of injustices.

[Tarquini] But if the difficulties are so much greater, is the reticence about 1956 not even more harmful?

[Ambartsumov] Be careful not to be blinded by preconceptions or oversimplifications. It is not all reticence on the subject of the 20th Congress and Khrushchev. Of course there are some writers who still defend Stalin. Be that as it may, historical research always needs a new approach -- not only toward 1956 but also perhaps toward the New Economic Policy and agricultural collectivization.

[Tarquini] Do Gorbachev's reforms take account of other socialist countries' experiences?

[Ambartsumov] Yes, we are looking with interest at other experiments, including Hungary's. But we are careful not to challenge the party's hegemony. The causes of the Yugoslav crisis constitute a clear warning.

PROGRAM DISCUSSES ROLE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

LD031028 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1620 GMT on 2 October carries a 40-minute "Questions of Theory" program with Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, CPSU Central Committee member and KOMMUNIST editor in chief, and political observer Georgiy Vladimirovich Pryakhin. The video shows Frolov and Pryakhin seated at a table throughout.

Pryakhin opens the program, saying: "Ivan Timofeyevich, our conversation is taking place on the very eve of the beginning of the new academic year in the party political education system."

Frolov notes the importance of theoretical underpinning for practical activity, and says: "Regrettably, the way things have turned out in our country, there has been, to put it mildly, an inadequate amount, a very inadequate amount of proper scientific economic, social, and philosophical forecasting. Our theoretical work for the most part, has involved a kind of production of commentaries, a description of what is and, unfortunately, it has very often involved the invention of things which do not even exist in real life, a varnishing of reality, so to speak, and so on. This has diverted many people's attention and in a certain fashion this has made practical, businesslike people adopt a negative attitude to theory, to science in many cases." But it is now clear to everyone that practical results are impossible without proper, forceful scientific elucidation and forecasting today. That is why the role of science is by and large increasing in contemporary society, and not just the role of natural and technical sciences, but also of social sciences."

Frolov then notes that the congress documents put stress on the social sphere. He notes: "Just take a look at how technocratic attitudes and a narrow understanding of the tasks which face us, including those of science, are harmful to us.

"Take the whole question of the diversion of part of the flow of the northern rivers. At certain stages, you see, this project of the century, as it was sometimes called, was viewed from an exclusively technological, engineering, and technical point of view, and all thes rest -- what we call the social sphere, the cultural sphere -- was not taken into account. And yet this project, its implemenation, involves millions of people."

Pryakhin asks: "Is this the human sphere?" Frolov responds: "Yes, and the project ought to be the object of social studies on these grounds along. Well, it must be stated that in the course of discussion of the problems which arose here a major role also was played by representatives of social sciences: writers, artists, and also those representatives who participated in different kinds of specialist commissions and gave expert opinions in this sphere. Not without reason, the Politburo decision which canceled, or rather deferred, the implementation of the project stressed that account was taken of the views of scientists and of public opinion at large. well, representatives of the social sciences can be charged with a multitude of sins -- and people are right to accuse them in this way: They can be accused of failing to offer enough suggestions of different types at previous stages here. This is all true. But we must bear in mind that scientific thought of this kind is expressed in the most forceful manner when there is a public need for it, when there is public demand. If disdain is shown to all these recommendations and so on, this has a strong influence...."

Pryakhin interrupts: "This has been the case of quite a long time -- several years or even decades."

Frolov says: "That is correct. So I do not want to make excuses for the inertia and lack of inititative of a very large number of social scientists. But we also must remember the active involvement, the energetic, bold, and enterprising actions of other social scientists, who may not have received any laurels -- if anything, quite the reverse, in fact. But they have existed, and they exist today. It would be wrong to fail to take their work into account. Our journal is currently striving to organize things in such a way -- and the Central Committee decision on the KOMMUNIST journal summons us to do this -- so that all these controversial, little-researched, or unresearched problems should be aired on the journal's pages, that they should be discussed, that different points of view should be expressed within the Marxist framework, but, in very many cases, they would be greatly differing views, so to speak. Then one can choose."

Frolov continues by discussing the importance of linking theory and practice in the context of restructuring and the pursuit of he new thinking, and describes some of the journals articles based on the congress directives. He talks about the relevance of Lenin's works to contemporary restructuring. Pryakhin notes that the 13th issue of KOMMUNIST asks readers to send in their own contributions. Frolov describes a recent round table meeting at the Novolipetskiy Metallurgical Combine, and notes the importance of the human factor in industry.

Pryakhin says: Both we in television and you at the journal -- this has already been mentioned -- are currently receiving quite a number of letters in which readers and viewers, people in general, raise controversial topical matters. In particular, I have twice done a commentary on a documentary film on bribe-taking."

Pryakhin notes that the film sparked a large amoung of mail.

Frolov then says: "This is a very major problem, and we also are currently attempting to discuss it in our journal to some degree. But I should first of all like to say the following: Those who draw some sort of link between bureaucratic tendencies and bribe-taking and so on and so forth are undoubtedly correct. There are links here. In the sort of atmosphere which is engendered by all types of distorted bureaucratic phenomena, phenomena such as bribe-taking, nonlabor income, and so on undoubtedly do flourish. But to go further and to arrive at even more sweeping conclusions is quite unwarranted. It can be said that the opposite is most likely true, that socialism is a society which for the first time organizes its life in such a way as to exclude such bureaucratic tendencies fully. When, for instance, attention is focused in the West on these phenomena in our country and it is said that they allegedly are inherent in socialism, and so on, they very often cite the energetic campaign against this that is being waged in our country. But this is an indirect indication of the incompatibility between socialism, the principles of socialism, and this phenomenon. That is why these problems are being tackled so robustly in our country, that is why such a strenuous campaign is being waged."

Pryakhin concludes the program saying that further programs will discuss the links between theory and practice, and he asks viewers to send in letters.

LABOR OFFICIAL COMMENTS ON WAGE REFORM

LD051146 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Oct 86

[Interview with Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, head of department in the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, by correspondent Gennadiy Kalenov; time and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] Today the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social problems [Goskomtrud] and the AUCCTU held a joint conference on the introduction of new conditions of labor remuneration for employees in the production industries of the national economy. Our correspondent Gennadiy Kalenov interviewed Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, head of the department in the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

[Begin recording] [Kalenov] The system of labor remuneration now in effect has not changed for many years, and naturally a lot of problems have built up.

[Shcherbakov] Yes, we last reviewed pay scales in about 1972. Moreover, we did not review them in a very comprehensive way. We were mainly concerned with raising the earnings of the lower-paid categories of employee. In the period since, of course, a great many problems have built up. In the first place, an incorrect balance has been created in the earnings of specialists and workers. In a large number of industries, such as mahcine-building, industrial construction materials, and mineral fertilizers, the earnings of specialists have come to be substantially lower than those of workers, not only in their rate of increase, but also in their absolute level.

For many years, perhaps 20 years or more, we have not reviewed the earnings of managers. Of course, the earnings of managers today cannot effectively help toward a resolution of the problems facing the national economy. For example, the salary of the director of a major knitwear factory of the first category comes to 250 rubles, while the average salary throughout the national economy is approaching 220 rubles. In this case, of course, the director is obviously on unequal terms.

Aside from this, we have delayed for too long in resolving questions of incentives for complex and highly-qualified labor. In such industries as the food industry, and light industry, the pay of a worker in category six is only 50 percent higher than that of a category one worker. Of course, given such an approach, the role of the rate of pay as an incentive is lowered, as there is no economic purpose in moving to a higher category or mastering more complex work when the same money can be earned by producing a larger number of ordinary items. Equipment today is quite different from what it was. Technology is quite different. Labor has become highly complex. For a long time we have not touched the earnings of such extremely important categories for manufacturing industry as repair-workers and adjusters. Although we have colossal basic funds in the country, we are unable to avail ourselves normally of almost one third of them because, among other things, we lack the repair workers with sufficient qualifications, and even lack sufficient numbers of them.

Many other problems have built up here, including the fact that earnings are not of a comprehensive nature [as heard] and we cannot regard the present system of remuneration as a sound basis for the resolution of such qualitatively different problems facing the national economy as putting all industries into a completely different relation to the world level, both in rate of growth in output, and in quality of output in the broad sense, above all in the technical quality of output. Taking this as their point of departure, the CPSU Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, and the AUCCTU adopted a decision in which, perhaps for the first time in recent years, all questions relating to the remuneration of employees in the manufacturing industries are resolved comprehensively. All elements of earnings are dealt with -- the tariff component, increases, additional payments, premiums. All this should considerably improve the organization of remuneration, ensure a transfer to more progressive norms, and finally, become a sound basis for an acceleration in the rate of the country's economic growth.

[Kalenov] Which categories of employee are covered, above all, by the reform, and which industries of our national economy?

[Shcherbakov] The remuneration reform covers all the manufacturing industries of the national economy: construction, transport, communications, industry, agriculture. We calculate that altogether approximately 75 million people will be affected by the remuneration reform.

[Kalenov] The principle of the reform is, the more you work, the more you get -- that is, the employee will have no ceiling as such on his earnings?

[Shcherbakov] In theory, yes. If in the past we controlled payments to individuals to a greater extent by means of a variety of instructions and methods, these funds must now be earned by the collective, and within the collective they must be distributed by the collective itself in accordance with the personal labor contribution of each employee. Thus individual earnings are not restricted by any centralized plans or instructions, and may be as great as the depth, qualifications, and quality of the employee's work.

[Kalenov] When will the reform take place?

[Shcherbakov] The reform is already starting now, and should be completed within the current 5-year plan. We calculate that within a year or two almost all well-organized enterprises and places where work is launched on the scale required will be capable of transferring to the new rates of pay and salaries. [end recording]

COSMOS-1783 SATELLITE LAUNCHED SUCCESSFULLY

LD040849 Moscow Tass International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Oct (TASS) -- Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1783, was launched in the USSR on Friday [3 October] for continuing space research. It has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution -- 5 hours, 58 minutes;
Apogee -- 20,045 kilometers;
Perigee -- 613 kilometers;
Orbital inclination 65.8 degrees.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

ANTARCTIC BASE DAMAGED BY GLACIER BREAK

LD060556 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Oct 86

[Text] Now we will acquaint you with a report that has reached us from the sixth continent of the planet. The edge of the Filchner Glacier has broken away from the coastal shelf of the Weddell Sea, in the northwest of Antarctica. This information was received with understandable alarm by scientists and specialists preparing the next, 32d Soviet Antarctic expedition. After all, it was precisely in the region of the destruction of the glacier that our Druzhnaya-1 station was situated. Our correspondent met Yevgeniy Sergeyevich Korotkevich, deputy director of the Arctic and Antarctic Institute, Doctor of geographical sciences. Here is his comment:

[Begin recording] [Korotkevich] Our field base, Druzhnaya, is the main center of our geological and geophysical research. It was set up 11 years ago in the Weddell Sea region, near the Filchner and Ronne -- these are extensive shelf glaciers -- and in the mountainous surroundings of those glaciers. It is a vast, extensive region, very interesting from a geological viewpoint, and we were planning to work with that base for many more years. It is a fairly large base -- it was equipped with a landing strip, an airfield for receiving planes. About 50 different small buildings, for (?branches), for an electric power station, for a radio station, for scientific inventions and for developing scientific materials had been built on it. But the Antarctic environment gave us a surprise. This region of the Filchner glacier broke up at a depth of approximately 100 km, and therefore the base, which was only 3 km from the edge of the glacier naturally turned out to be an iceberg and floated away. Well, what state is it in now? We do not know. Moreover, this data is based on information from artificial earth satellites. For the time being, we cannot see the station itself. We only know that it has broken away. But we do not know what condition it is in.

[Unidentified correspondent] There weren't any people there?

[Korotkevich] No, there weren't. It had been mothballed for the day, but this year we were preparing to work for a season there. In other words, there will, of course, be some changes in the expedition's program in connection with this. We will have to restore that base in order to continue work in that region in future. [end recording]

As we have been told, the geophysical research on the southern continent will not only be continued, but also considerably expanded, in spite of what has happened. Researchers have at their disposal the well-equipped Soyuz station, the Druzhnaya-2 station. New stations will also come into operation in Antarctica, where new winter personnel will go in the very near future.

TASS ANNOUNCES NUCLEAR SUBMARINE SINKS 6 OCT

LD061657 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 6 Oct 86

["TASS announcement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 6 TASS -- From October 3 to 6, 1986, the crew of the Soviet submarine, in which an accident happened, and the crews of the Soviet ships, which approached the scene, were engaged in an effort to keep her afloat.

Despite the efforts, the submarine has not been rescued.

At 1103 am on October 6, it sank at a great depth. The crew has been evacuated to the Soviet ships, which approached the scene. There have been no other losses among the crew, apart from those which were reported on October 4, 1986.

An effort is continuing to find out the circumstances, which resulted in the loss of the submarine, but the immediate cause is the speedy flooding of water from the outside. The reactor has been shut down. According to the conclusion of specialists, the possibility of a nuclear explosion and radioactive contamination of the environment is excluded.

AFP REPORTS SHEVARDNADZE CONFIRMS SUB DEATHS

For a Paris AFP in Spanish report that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze confirmed at a 4 October press conference in Mexico City that there had been three deaths in a nuclear submarine accident off the Bermudas, see page K4 of today's Latin America & Caribbean section of the Soviet DAILY REPORT.

CONFERENCE ON PARTRIOTIC EDUCATION HELD IN BAKU

PM031125 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEDZA in Russion 30 Sep 86 Second Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel N. Mulyar: "Worthy Recruits for the Army"]

[Text] Matters relating to military patriotic and international education of young people and preparation of them for army service have been discussed at a conference in Baku.

It was attended by first secretaries of Transcaucasian republics' Communist Party Central Committees, representatives of party and soviet bodies, and leaders of a number of ministries and departments, military commissariats, and DOSAAF.

The conference was addressed by K. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Centray Committee; Army General M. Zaytsev, and Colonel General K. Kochetov, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District.